

8608

didate for political office which is diverted from political campaign purposes to the personal use of the candidate or other individual constitutes taxable income to such candidate or other individual.

I.T. 3276, C.B. 1939-1 (Part 1), 108, modified.

Advice is requested whether that part of the political contributions received by a political organization or an individual seeking political office which is diverted to the personal use of the candidate or other individual constitutes taxable income to such candidate or other individual.

Contributions to political organizations are customarily made with the intent and understanding that they be used for the expenses of a political campaign or for some similar purpose. Such contributions are not deductible for Federal income tax purposes by the donor. See I.T. 3276, C.B. 1939-1 (pt. 1), 108.

Where a political gift is received by an individual or a political organization and it is held or used for the purposes intended; i.e., for present or future expenses of a political campaign or for some similar purpose, it is not taxable income to the recipient. See I.T. 3276, supra. However, any amount diverted from the channel of campaign activities and used by a candidate or other individual for personal use constitutes taxable income to such candidate or other individual for the year in which the funds are so diverted. For example, a candidate seeking political office receives contributions totaling \$1,000 from individuals and organizations for use in his campaign for election to such office. During the campaign the candidate expends \$600 of the contributed funds for campaign purposes. He uses the balance of the campaign funds to reduce the mortgage on his personal residence. In such a case the candidate will be required to include in his taxable income the \$400 which represents the portion of the fund which he diverted to his personal use. Such amount will be includible in taxable income in the year in which so diverted.

I.T. 3276, supra, is modified to the extent that it is inconsistent with the views expressed herein.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD another Treasury Department ruling, dated November 13, 1961, signed by Commissioner Mortimer Caplin and addressed to Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 13, 1961.

HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: This letter relates to the treatment, for Federal income tax purposes, of campaign contributions received by an individual or a political organization, and is written to confirm our telephone conversation of November 2, 1961.

The basic rule applicable to this area of the law, as set forth in I.T. 3276, Cumulative Bulletin 1939-1 (part 1), 108, and Revenue Ruling 54-80, Cumulative Bulletin 1954-1, 11, is that a campaign or political contribution received by an individual or political organization is not includible in the income of the recipient, to the extent it is used for present or future expenses of a political or similar purpose; however, the portion of the contribution which is diverted to the personal use of the candidate or other individual is includible in his gross income in the year the funds are so diverted.

The aforementioned rulings were cited with approval in the leading case dealing with campaign contributions, *O'Dwyer v. Commissioner*, (C.A. 4th 1959) 266 F. 2d 575,

where the Court held that Revenue Ruling 54-80 was declaratory of judicial interpretation of existing law, and thus concluded that political contributions were to be treated as income where the taxpayer failed to prove that they were not diverted to the taxpayer's personal use. (See also *Manson L. Reichert*, (1953) 19 T.C. 1027, affirmed on other grounds (C.C.A. 7th 1954) 214 F. 2d 19, and *Orland J. Ridenour*, T.C. Memo 1957-126, which are in accord with the rulings).

In sum, campaign or political contributions are considered gifts conditioned upon their being used for the purpose for which given.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There has been no change in the law since 1954 and 1961 and these rulings are still in effect.

Next, to establish that the contributions and tickets purchased to these Connecticut dinners were normal political campaign contributions, I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent out by the treasurer of the dinner committee in solicitation of these funds be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There is no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 16, 1963.

DEAR ———: In 1964, our friend, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, will campaign for reelection to the U.S. Senate. It does not seem necessary for me to stress the heavy financial burden that this campaign will involve. For this reason, it is necessary for those of us who respect and admire Senator DODD to lend whatever aid we can to assist him in presenting a vigorous campaign. To this end, we have scheduled October 26 as a fund-raising date throughout the State, and we are fortunate enough to be able to announce that Vice President Lyndon B. JOHNSON will be here in Connecticut throughout the entire day to take part in the various activities planned for that day.

Here in Fairfield County, we have scheduled a cocktail party at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Archie Perry, 750 Verna Hill Road, Fairfield, between the hours of 3 p.m. and 5 p.m. The Vice President and Senator DODD will be at Mr. and Mrs. Perry's home and an invitation to that party will be sent to you at your request. Inasmuch as Mr. and Mrs. Perry have been gracious enough to give us their home for this occasion and have underwritten the expenses in connection with the party, it is our hope that the various guests will see fit to make contributions of \$100 or more. I hope you can find it within your means and power to help us assist the Senator by being present.

The cocktail party is followed by a dinner at the Stratfield Motor Inn. The dinner is scheduled to commence at 7:30 P.M. and one or more tickets will be sent at your request. We fully expect this dinner to be a gala affair and I would very much like to see you there with whatever guests you may elect to bring with you. The subscription for this dinner is \$25.00 or more per person. Needless to say, I am very anxious for these affairs to be outstanding successes, and I would consider it a great personal favor if you decide that you can take part.

I hope to talk with you personally about this matter within the next few days, but in the event that I am not able to make all the necessary phone calls, I hope you will not resent it if one of my secretaries calls you concerning it.

In the event you can reach your decision

without a phone call, please feel free to send me your check for one or both affairs made payable to me as Treasurer, Dodd Dinner.

Cordially,

PAUL.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM—OBSERVATIONS OF SENATOR RUSSELL OF GEORGIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in an interview appearing in this week's U.S. News & World Report, our distinguished colleague, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, made some extremely important and significant observations and statements in answering timely and urgent questions about the present and future course of the war in Vietnam.

The Senator from Georgia is widely and justly recognized as one of the best informed and most authoritative men in the world on our military affairs and problems. From his vantage point as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and from his vast and illustrious experience in defense matters and other national affairs, he is uniquely qualified to speak with wisdom and authority on this very vital matter.

In addition, the high respect which all have for his personal and intellectual integrity, and his well-deserved reputation for sound, prudent, and conscientious judgments and conclusions, dictate that his landmark statements be given careful and searching consideration at the highest echelons of our Government, by the Congress and by the American public.

In a perceptive column in this morning's New York Times entitled "Clearing the Fog of Policy," the respected columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, correctly states that Senator RUSSELL's judgment "will be influential in shaping the attitude of Congress toward the administration's conduct of the war."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the interview with Senator RUSSELL as reported in U.S. News & World Report, and Mr. Krock's fine column, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report,
May 2, 1966]

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW: SENATOR RUSSELL ON VIETNAM: "GO IN AND WIN—OR GET OUT"

(NOTE.—Some of the most influential Democrats in Congress are beginning to have second thoughts about the war in Vietnam—and about the administration's way of dealing with it. Is the time for half measures at an end? Should the United States buckle down and win, or turn around and bring its fighting forces home?)

(Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, is one of the best-informed men on U.S. military affairs, worldwide. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he has up-to-the-minute knowledge of operations in Vietnam. In this exclusive interview, the Senator answers urgent questions about the war and its future.)

Question. Senator RUSSELL, do you sense that people are getting increasingly disturbed and impatient over the way the United States is trying to fight the war in Vietnam?

(3) All expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

(4) The name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made, and the date thereof.

(c) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding \$10 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bill and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least 2 years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 303, 43 Stat. 1071.)

SECTION 243. ACCOUNTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED

Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within 5 days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 304, 43 Stat. 1071.)

SECTION 244. STATEMENTS BY TREASURER FILED WITH CLERK OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file with the Clerk between the 1st and 10th days of March, June, and September, in each year, and also between the 10th and 15th days, and on the 5th day, next preceding the date on which a general election is to be held, at which candidates are to be elected in two or more States, and also on the 1st day of January, a statement containing, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) The name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of \$100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution;

(2) The total sum of the contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);

(3) The total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

(4) The name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of \$10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such committee, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(5) The total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4);

(6) The total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee during the calendar year.

(b) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) of this section shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

(c) The statement filed on the 1st day of January shall cover the preceding calendar year. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 305, 43 Stat. 1071.)

SECTION 245. STATEMENT BY OTHERS THAN POLITICAL COMMITTEE FILED WITH CLERK OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Every person (other than a political committee) who makes an expenditure in one or more items, other than by contribution to a political committee, aggregating \$50 or more within a calendar year for the purpose of influencing in two or more States the election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk an itemized detailed statement of such

expenditure in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 244 of this title. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 306, 43 Stat. 1072.)

SECTION 246. STATEMENTS BY CANDIDATES FOR SENATOR, REPRESENTATIVE, DELEGATE, OR RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FILED WITH SECRETARY OF SENATE AND CLERK OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(a) Every candidate for Senator shall file with the Secretary and every candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall file with the Clerk not less than ten nor more than fifteen days before, and also within thirty days after, the date on which an election is to be held, a statement containing, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) A correct and itemized account of each contribution received by him or by any person for him with his knowledge or consent, from any source, in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, together with the name of the person who has made such contribution;

(2) A correct and itemized account of each expenditure made by him or by any person for him with his knowledge or consent, in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, together with the name of the person to whom such expenditure was made; except that only the total sum of expenditures for items specified in subdivision (c) of section 248 of this title need be stated;

(3) A statement of every promise or pledge made by him or by any person for him with his consent, prior to the closing of the polls on the day of the election, relative to the appointment or recommendation for appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment for the purpose of procuring support in his candidacy, and the name, address, and occupation of every person to whom any such promise or pledge has been made, together with the description of any such position. If no such promise or pledge has been made, that fact shall be specifically stated.

(b) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) of this section shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

(c) Every candidate shall inclose with his first statement a report, based upon the records of the proper State official, stating the total number of votes cast for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, at the general election next preceding the election at which he is a candidate. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 307, 43 Stat. 1072.)

SECTION 247. STATEMENTS; VERIFICATION; FILING; PRESERVATION; INSPECTION

A statement required by this chapter to be filed by a candidate or treasurer of a political committee or other person with the Clerk or Secretary, as the case may be—

(a) Shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such statement, taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths;

(b) Shall be deemed properly filed when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and directed to the Clerk or Secretary at Washington, D.C., but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such statement shall be promptly filed upon notice by the Clerk or Secretary of its nonreceipt;

(c) Shall be preserved by the Clerk or Secretary for a period of 2 years from the date of filing, shall constitute a part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 308, 43 Stat. 1072.)

SECTION 248. LIMITATION UPON AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURES BY CANDIDATE

(a) A candidate, in his campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the laws of the State in which he is a candidate, nor in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the provisions of this chapter and section 208 of title 18.¹

(b) Unless the laws of his State prescribe a less amount as the maximum limit of campaign expenditures, a candidate may make expenditures up to—

(1) The sum of \$10,000 if a candidate for Senator, or the sum of \$2,500 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner; or

(2) An amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, but in no event exceeding \$25,000 if a candidate for Senator or \$5,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

(c) Money expended by a candidate to meet and discharge any assessment, fee, or charge made or levied upon candidates by the laws of the State in which he resides, or expended for his necessary personal, traveling, or subsistence expenses, or for stationery, postage, writing, or printing (other than for use on billboards or in newspapers), for distributing letters, circulars, or posters, or for telegraph or telephone service, shall not be included in determining whether his expenditures have exceeded the sum fixed by paragraph (1) or (2) of subdivision (b) of this section as the limit of campaign expenses of a candidate. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 309, 43 Stat. 1073.)

SECTION 252. GENERAL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS

(a) Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions of this chapter, except those for which a specific penalty is imposed by section 208 of title 18, and section 251 of this title¹ shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any of the foregoing provisions of this chapter, except those for which a specific penalty is imposed by section 208 of title 18, and section 251 of this title,¹ shall be fined not more than \$10,000 and imprisoned not more than 2 years. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 314, 43 Stat. 1074.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Next I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Revenue Ruling 54-80, dated 1954, regulation 118, interpreting this law.

There being no objection, the ruling was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNAL REVENUE BULLETIN, CUMULATIVE BULLETIN 1954-1, JANUARY-JUNE 1954

PART I.—CURRENT RULINGS, DECISIONS, ETC. INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Chapter 1.—Income tax

PART II.—COMPUTATION OF NET INCOME

Section 22(a).—Gross income; General definition

Regulations 118, section 39.22(a)-1: What included in gross income. (Rev. Rul. 54-80.)

The portion of a political contribution received by a political organization or a can-

¹ Sec. 208 of title 18 repealed by act June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 862. Present provision of said sec. 208 are covered by sec. 602 of title 18.

April 27, 1966

Answer. Yes. I think the attitude of the average person is that we should go in and win—or else get out.

I don't think the present method of waging war over there meets with the approval of the majority of people I come in contact with. These people I'm talking about feel that, if we have the means to get this war over, then we should bring it to a conclusion as speedily as we can.

If we have to be caught up there in tides of religious controversy and political controversy and philosophical disagreements to the point that the lives of American boys are endangered when they walk down the streets of a city they have come to save from the Communists—if that's the case—then it's time we reexamine our entire position, however painful that reexamination might be.

We can, of course, carry on this war at a great cost of life for a conflict of this size—and at a tremendous expense in dollars.

We can win it, eventually. But—unless we get some cohesion of purpose within South Vietnam—it will be a pyrrhic victory, because they will immediately go to fighting among themselves when we leave.

Question. Could we win the war, and then have to stay on to help them?

Answer. We could win, of course, but we would have to take the whole countryside, and practically make hostages of the South Vietnamese. I would be very strongly opposed to any such course, and I think most of the American people would be, too.

Question. You seem to be saying that this whole effort in South Vietnam is built on quicksand, so far as the United States is concerned.

Answer. Now please understand: I'm speaking as an individual Member of the U.S. Senate, and not attempting, in any wise, to express any policy of Government—either present policy or in the future.

For my part I think a very careful survey should be made in South Vietnam as to what people in the cities really think. If that survey shows that the majority of them are anti-American, I think we should withdraw now, because we can't possibly win if we are fighting an enemy in front of us while the people we are supposed to be helping are against us and want us out of their country.

It wouldn't be easy for us to extricate ourselves, but we could do it. Having absolute command of the seas and the air, we could accomplish a withdrawal without great loss.

IF AMERICA WITHDRAWS

Question. Would it be disastrous for us to pull out?

Answer. Not if these anti-American demonstrations continue, no.

I have often said that we couldn't just "tuck tail and run" as long as the Vietnamese were fighting at our side—and they have been very courageous in battle.

But I don't think you could expect anybody—Americans or anybody else—to stay in a country where it became very apparent that they were not wanted. It's not good manners to stay in a man's house against his wishes.

Question. Would an American withdrawal be disastrous all through southeast Asia?

Answer. I don't buy this so-called "domino theory."

Cambodia and Laos might go, along with South Vietnam, if we left. But I don't think that's any irreplaceable loss. Neither of them has any tremendous military value, either strategic or tactical. And they certainly have no great economic value. Heaven knows, we've poured out more foreign aid per capita in those countries than we have almost anywhere else in the world.

But to get back to your question: I don't think that, if we pulled out of South Vietnam, it necessarily means that most of Asia would fall to the Chinese Communists.

Thailand has an entirely different background. It's been a rather benevolent

monarchy, and their people are accustomed to living under their own Government.

The Burmese have an entirely different set of ethics and tradition than those that prevail in South Vietnam.

You find different conditions in country after country. As a matter of fact, even the North Vietnamese have shown a great reluctance to let any Chinese in their country.

Question. If the United States stays on in Vietnam, do you see any prospect that other allied nations will give us more support?

Answer. Of course, these demonstrations have chilled a tremendous amount of work that had been done to get them in. I read somewhere that the Koreans are holding up on sending another division. The Philippines had just about decided to send combat elements and, naturally, they're standing back now to see whether they're going to send them into a trap where a man can't tell friend from foe.

It's very unfortunate, from the standpoint of the South Vietnamese, if they really want freedom from communism, that these demonstrations have been touched off against those who are giving the effort and blood in their behalf.

Question. What about India? Is that country a potential source of help?

Answer. No. India plays both ends against the middle, and you can depend on that any time, anywhere, in any controversy—they'll be working both sides of the street.

WHY U.N. CAN'T HELP

Question. The United Nations was created to keep peace. Couldn't it do something about the Communist aggression in Vietnam?

Answer. Personally, I think that, as a military factor in preserving the peace, the United Nations is about as weak a reed as you could find to lean on.

It serves a useful purpose as a forum where men can talk rather than fight, where the force of world opinion can be felt—and, in that sense, it has been an instrument of peace. But, as far as actually stopping any military conflict of any size, I don't think the United Nations can do it.

Question. Could Britain be of more help to us out there?

Answer. We ought to bring pressure on our British cousins to keep them from sending any British-flag vessels into North Vietnam. As a matter of fact, I think the British should have stopped their shipping already.

You see, this has been entirely unilateral—this question of assistance to and from our allies.

In the case of Britain, we have fallen over ourselves to accede to their requests in their difficulties with Rhodesia—which certainly are minor compared with what we face in Vietnam. But, at the same time, they claim they can't stop their ships' going into North Vietnam.

Well, I'd give them another chance to stop them, because I'm sure they can. Then, if they can't—or don't—we have the means of stopping them.

Question. Are you saying that the United States made a mistake in using its power to back Great Britain in Rhodesia while the British go on trading with the Communists?

Answer. Of course, I am opposed to our having anything whatever to do with this Rhodesian situation—and I'm all the more opposed to it when it's unilateral action on our part, without any quid pro quo whatever by the British in helping us with our much larger difficulties in Asia.

There's considerable potential danger in that Rhodesian situation, you know.

It's a rather remarkable commentary on present-day history—when men are supposed to be getting soft—that 220,000 people in a nation of about 4 million would undertake to maintain themselves not only there but against their mother country and against the power of the United Nations and the United States, as well.

Their courage may exceed their judgment, but they have, at least, shown a considerable desire to run their own country as they wish.

HITTING REEDS HARDER

Question. Senator RUSSELL, to return to Vietnam: If the United States is to continue in that war, what do you think should now be done?

Answer. For more than 6 months now—at every conference I have attended, no matter at what level—I have been vigorously urging that we apply greater force to the regime in North Vietnam. That's the source of all our trouble.

Long ago, we should have started applying pressure on Hanoi so that those people, like civilized beings, would come to a conference table and settle this thing.

Question. Does this pressure include closing the harbor at Haiphong?

Answer. Yes—closing the port, bombing the iron works in Hanoi, the fuel dumps, and any other resource that they have that can be utilized to any degree by them to kill American boys.

There are several things that must be done unless we are going to take 8 or 10 years to win the war. One of them is to blockade the coast completely, so they can't get any aid from the outside. Another is to see that the two railroad lines from China into North Vietnam cannot function on the North Vietnamese side of the border.

These things should be done.

Of course, we can probably win the war with the present methods, if we don't care anything about the size of casualty lists or the cost in dollars—and are ready to spend 8 or 10 years doing it.

UNITED STATES AS A POLICEMAN

Question. Senator, this whole affair is clearly slowing down, and with not much help from other countries. Do you think the United States is destined to continue being the policeman for peace in the whole world?

Answer. I'd be very much opposed to the United States serving as the world's policeman.

We are the most powerful Nation on earth. We have certain responsibilities that accompany that power, and I would not have us disregard them. But to take the initiative every time trouble arises and say, "We'll handle it," without having a thorough understanding that each of our associates will contribute according to his means—no.

I'm not in favor of any more of these unilateral adventures in enforcing peace in the world unless our own interests are directly involved.

[From New York Times, Apr. 26, 1966]

IN THE NATION: CLEARING THE FOG OF POLICY (By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, whose adverse examination of the administration's conduct of the war in Vietnam was published today in U.S. News & World Report, is not vulnerable to the usual official disparagements of its critics. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he is much better informed than most of them. He has supported every Presidential request for legislation to strengthen the Executive hand in Vietnam. And he has amply demonstrated his personal devotion to Mr. Johnson.

SENATOR RUSSELL'S INFLUENCE

Moreover, no Member of Congress is held in higher respect for the integrity of his character and the care he expends in reaching conclusions. So there can be little question that Senator RUSSELL's judgment, as expressed in his published interview, that "we should go in and win or get out" in Vietnam will be influential in shaping the attitude of Congress toward the administration's conduct of the war. This influence will surely be manifest, whether or not the plight of the

April 27, 1966

United States in this involvement will continue it to more intense, though still covert, pressure on the President to reexamine the policy on the following propositions set forth by Russell.

When American military personnel and civilians cannot move about safely in the streets of cities held by the Saigon Government, the time has come for a survey of the popular attitude toward their presence and its purpose of preserving the independence of the nation. If a majority inclined to this presence, despite its purpose, is indicated, the United States should withdraw. "We can't win if those we're trying to help want us out," except in the form of a "pyrrhic victory" (a victory gained at too great cost).

Withdrawal would be difficult, but wholly feasible because the United States has sufficient air and sea power to cover it.

Asian Communist domination as a consequence of American withdrawal would probably include Laos and Cambodia. But this would not be an "irreparable loss" to the non-Communist world, because Laos and Cambodia have "no great military or economic value." And their loss would not prove the "domino theory" (which Russell said he didn't believe in at all). For example, it would not dispel the anti-Peking determination of Thailand and Burma. And, so far as India is concerned, that nation "has always played both sides of the street" and will continue to do so.

HESTITATION ON AID

The demonstrations against the United States and the Ky government in Saigon have already caused Asiatic governments to hesitate to give the United States the military assistance in Vietnam they were arranging to contribute. This prolongs the largely unilateral character of the burden the United States has assumed in Vietnam, a product of the unwise policy by which this Government is disposed to take the initiative in every time of trouble abroad, saying "we'll handle it."

That policy should always be conditioned on assurance that our allies will participate. A glaring example to the contrary is our acceptance of the contention of the United Kingdom that it can't even prevent British ships from trading with North Vietnam, while allowing this Government to be dragged into the internal quarrel of the Commonwealth in Rhodesia.

But, since the United States has heavily and almost unilaterally involved its military and economic power in Vietnam, the administration's failure to pursue the war with the force required "is the source of all our trouble." We should delay no longer in closing the port of Haiphong, bombing the Hanoi iron works, blackading the entire North Vietnamese coast, destroying the two railroads entering the country from Communist China—in short, destroy any degree of North Vietnamese resource "to kill Americans." Under the present policy, the war cannot terminate in even a pyrrhic victory in less than 8 to 10 years, at the steadily growing cost of American casualties and billions of dollars.

BASIC POLICY FLAW

But the basic overall policy flaw asserted by Senator Russell is that it commits the United States, as in Vietnam, to wasteful and bloody adventure "when our own interest is not directly involved."

President Johnson has been adamant in rejecting all such appraisals, as well as every one of the alternatives which Senator Russell proposed in the interview. But events may force him to the policy reexamination and revision which now has openly acquired its most influential congressional champion.

CELEBRATING 1,000 YEARS OF POLAND'S HISTORY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the month of May throughout the world—and particularly in America—the sons and daughters of Poland and their friends—all lovers of liberty—will celebrate the Polish millennium—a thousand years of Poland's history as a nation.

In my State of Rhode Island, the observance will center about a magnificent Mass—on our Memorial Day, May 30—a Mass celebrated in the Cathedral of St. Peter and Paul. The day will come to a close with a tremendous banquet at which all the dignitaries of our State will pay honor to a country we revere because we know and admire those sons and daughters of Poland who contribute so much to the community and the country.

A thousand years ago Poland's first historical ruler was converted to Christianity following his marriage to the Bohemian Princess Dobrava. That signified the entry of the dynasty and the people into the Western World—into the orbit of the church of Rome. So the Polish border became the dividing line between the East and the West.

The drama of Poland's thousand years challenges the pen of the historian—who will always include the miracle of Czestochowa—whose Black Madonna helped a handful of Poles to resist foreign invaders for 40 days—helped them to victory—since which time that Madonna has been venerated as the Queen of Poland.

In the last quarter of a century, Poland has known invasion and persecution on a scale not surpassed in its thousand years.

But the flame of freedom still burns in Polish hearts—and in the prayers of their friends in America.

For shame that the Communist overlords of Poland should seek to banish Christianity from this historic celebration.

So it is to the greater glory of the 50,000 who bowed before the cathedral in Poznan as Cardinal Wyszynski celebrated Mass on Sunday, April 17.

The area before the cathedral was black with people—they were on every tree—wall—fence or low building within sight. They joined in the singing and in the responses of the Mass.

And the crowd sang the patriotic hymns of Poland—their Poland—as the figure of the Black Madonna was taken from its place above the altar and carried in procession. The Madonna had been brought to Poznan from its shrine the night before—and all through the night—the faithful of Poland came to pray before the shrine.

I like the reporter's story as he tells us that the Mass was a manifestation of confidence in the church—expressed in a silently joyous mood. Even those walking alone were smiling as they passed through streets where candles, crosses, and religious pictures contrasted with the grim military posters of communism.

Poland's celebration is one to touch every human heart—and in the great surge of ecumenism—we see an inspiration in the faith of the Poles that survives every persecution.

TIME FOR HER TO GO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Federal bureaucracy is replete with little bureaucratic empires administered by firmly entrenched civil servants. A notable example is the U.S. Passport Office, a division of the Department of State, headed by Frances G. Knight. It is reported that Miss Knight is a competent administrator. The fact is that there are many able and competent civil servants. By her injecting her particular political philosophy in the operation of the Passport Office and her behind-the-scenes activities in behalf of political causes, she has become unfit for the important position she holds. Her comments with reference to a recent departmental reprimand are ample evidence of this fact.

She has characterized her immediate superior, Acting Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Philip Heymann, as a "32-year-old whiz kid." She has referred to the directorship of Abba Schwartz, Heymann's predecessor, as "the era of Schwartzism." The immediate cause for the reprimand was the fact that Miss Knight exceeded her authority in asking U.S. Embassy officials abroad to keep an eye on a Harvard professor traveling in Europe. Evidently, Miss Knight regards herself one of those superduper patriots who considers it her duty to judge the patriotism of other Americans. I do not like people who seek to play God with other people's patriotism. Let her do her judging in private life and not as Director of the U.S. Passport Office. The recent conduct and actions of this bureaucrat are really intolerable.

Incidentally, Mr. President, Abba Schwartz was an outstanding public servant. He was appointed to his position by the late President John F. Kennedy. He was an advocate of liberal travel policies. He was a respected, dedicated official who was a leader in opposing restrictive quotas limiting admission to the United States for certain nationality groups and was in favor of liberalizing our discriminatory and cruel immigration laws. In doing so, it is evident he incurred the wrath of Miss Knight. If this lady refers to Abba Schwartz' direction of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs as the "era of Schwartzism," may I say it is an "ism" that is infinitely more desirable than McCarthyism, rightwing extremism and other "isms" for which Frances Knight has manifested her affection and devotion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Since the end of January this year to the 1st of April, the CCC inventory of wheat has been reduced from 530,288,000 bushels to 343,978,000 bushels. This is the lowest April 1 wheat reserve level since 1953. There are, of course, several millions of bushels of uncommitted wheat available in addition to the CCC stocks, but total available wheat stocks are lower than at any time since the height of the Korean war.

The USDA for several months has been predicting that the total carryover of wheat; that is, uncommitted wheat in all positions including CCC stocks, would be over 600 million bushels. But it is becoming increasingly apparent that these earlier estimates are overly optimistic.

Without a significant increase in wheat acreage allotments this fall, the wheat reserves will be sharply reduced again next year. Total 1966 wheat production is currently estimated at 1,391 million bushels, the second largest crop in history. But disappearance of wheat for 1965-66 will be at least 1.5 billion. Disappearance will probably be higher in 1966-67. Thus, even with a bumper crop, disappearance will again be greater than production, with the result that carry-over on July 1, 1967 may well be less than 400 million bushels.

This gives cause for real concern in that the USDA's own estimates place the minimum safe carryover of wheat for national security needs at 630 million bushels.

The decline in corn reserves has been even more drastic. Since the end of January this year the CCC inventory of corn has been reduced from 509,106,000 bushels to 174,562,000 bushels as of April 1966. This is the lowest April 1 inventory of corn since 1949.

Other reserves have been sharply depleted. The April 1 inventory of grain sorghum is the lowest for that date since 1959. The CCC inventory of butter is down by 50 percent from April 1, 1965. There has also been a 50-percent reduction in the CCC barley inventory between April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966. The 10,690,000 bushels held by the CCC as of the first of this month is the lowest for that date since 1955.

CCC stocks of beans, rice, soybeans, dried milk and cheese are virtually nonexistent or totally depleted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain statistical tables documenting the decline of CCC stocks be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the above survey demonstrates, I believe, that there is a pressing necessity for expanded production to meet national security needs. But I fear that this need will not be recognized and acted on in time. With conditions as they are in southeast Asia, such a failure could well be disastrous.

There is a real danger that our reserves will be allowed to be dangerously depleted because of two major reasons.

First, too many Government planners and policymakers are likely to be blinded by a surplus-control complex. So accustomed to thinking in terms of surpluses and the need for controls they may, quite unintentionally, err and not recognize soon enough the need for expanded production.

The second reason is the aggressive-ness with which the administration has been pursuing its policy of indirect price control. One of the major objectives of this unauthorized control policy has been to keep down farm prices. An excellent example of this is the massive dumping of corn on the open market of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

From February 1 to April 1, 1966, the CCC has dumped 334,544,000 bushels of corn. Gardner Ackly, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, has stated that these sales were aimed at forcing a rollback in the prices of commodities which would in turn serve to

increase pork production, thus, ultimately bring about a drop in pork prices.

But as a result of the aggressive execution of this policy our corn reserves have been virtually depleted. This has been a foolhardy action, one which has been dictated by the narrow and shortsighted view of an administration bent on warding off an inflation which its own spending policy has created. This ill-conceived action will come back to haunt the administration in the months ahead.

Mr. President, I want to reemphasize that a sudden removal of all production controls would not be in the best interests of farmers or the Nation. However, the time has come for fewer restrictions on production and greater freedom for the farmer is absolutely necessary. And, finally, it should be clear to all that any further dumping of CCC stocks as calculated effort by the administration to force down farm prices would be intolerable and foolhardy.

EXHIBIT 1

CCC Inventory as of Apr. 1

[Quantities in thousands]

	Wheat	Corn	Grain sorghum	Beans	Barley
	Bushels	Bushels	Hundred-weight	Hundred-weight	Bushels
1954.....	438,317	441,683	34	973	469
1955.....	675,537	613,811	4,808	147	7,115
1956.....	831,814	737,682	14,112	2,014	38,162
1957.....	771,800	926,317	28,215	1,811	33,856
1958.....	716,969	1,077,152	42,276	50	28,752
1959.....	749,239	1,116,137	154,361	18	69,805
1960.....	1,074,495	1,209,606	268,054	180	69,693
1961.....	1,078,115	1,429,035	307,693	1,838	60,742
1962.....	1,076,746	981,259	555,076	330	32,002
1963.....	1,010,410	748,116	612,451	615	27,999
1964.....	898,122	779,069	542,991	27	29,512
1965.....	641,824	603,719	551,373	59	20,927
1966.....	343,978	174,562	202,661	2	10,690

[Quantities in thousands]

	Rice	Butter	Dried milk	Cheese	Soybeans
	Hundred-weight	Hundred-weight	Pounds	Pounds	Bushels
1954.....	5,214	330,441	570,103	319,115	171
1955.....	3,846	355,142	225,005	407,097	1
1956.....	1,433	113,709	141,921	294,904	67
1957.....	6,396	27,540	130,378	207,023	16
1958.....	2,990	82,159	146,801	187,571	1,438
1959.....	5,891	41,803	119,632	11,071	11,676
1960.....	333	44,249	173,823	11,653	10,579
1961.....	1,013	72,230	264,565	197	174
1962.....	2	271,041	425,092	67,011	1
1963.....	1,097	430,437	698,713	80,164	9,406
1964.....	664	162,724	409,650	27,342	44
1965.....	189	60,237	228,680	8,330	10
1966.....		109	12,371		

As of Mar. 11, 1966.

Source: Financial Analysis Branch, ASCS, USDA.

CLASHES WITH ADVANCED SOVIET AIRCRAFT OVER NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the latest reports of clashes with advanced aircraft over North Vietnam must be viewed with the gravest concern.

The Soviet Union has made these high-performance aircraft available to North Vietnam.

We do not know who is flying the planes.

We do not know where the planes are based—whether in North Vietnam or across the border in China.

But the Secretary of State has said—and a State Department spokesman repeated yesterday—that there will be no sanctuary.

Our planes will pursue hostile aircraft to wherever they go—even over the bor-

April 27, 1966

der of China—and that there is no sanctuary for Chinese bases.

What is occurring in North Vietnam is escalation of the war by them or us. The fact is that we are inexorably involved.

That fact and its implications must be faced.

What will be the Chinese response, if her territory is bombed or her airspace invaded?

Will the Chinese seek to strike at our bases—in Vietnam, or Thailand, or aboard our aircraft carriers?

And if they do, what then will our response be—further bombing?

And if the scale of bombing increases, will China confine herself to air fighting—or will it send its troops to engage ours on the ground in South Vietnam or elsewhere?

Mr. James Reston reports today in the New York Times that our military planners are not concerned over the possible consequences of this escalation.

They are said to feel that "China and the Soviet Union will tolerate military defeats the United States clearly would not tolerate itself."

Such assumptions are not a sound basis for policy.

Similar assumptions about the Vietcong and North Vietnam have been proven wrong time and again in this war.

More importantly, there is still great political instability in South Vietnam.

And South Vietnam is where the war is being fought—the only area of Vietnam in which our goals can be accomplished.

Without a viable political structure in South Vietnam, the efforts and sacrifice of our fighting men will be wasted.

But no military action in North Vietnam or China can create or contribute to the creation of such a political structure in South Vietnam.

The extension of the war into China will not in my judgment give us success in South Vietnam.

Premier Ky and the Buddhist Tri Quang do not talk with one another.

Escalation of the war in the north, whatever else it is expected to achieve, will not bring these two gentlemen to the conference table with one another.

We must face the fact that what we need most is a unified effort within South Vietnam.

We must have some certainty that the people of South Vietnam can engage in such a united effort—that they have the will and the ability to organize their society and government to continue the fight.

This is where we should now be devoting our best efforts and talents. We must face the fact that there is no quick or easy answer to Vietnam.

There is some disagreement with our overall course in Vietnam.

But even accepting our basic policy, it appears to me neither prudent nor wise to undertake risks of a still wider war until our own houses are in order, and the necessary stability achieved in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles which appeared in the New York

Times this morning. The first article, by James Reston, is entitled "Washington: There Is No Sanctuary"; and the other article, by C. L. Sulzberger, is entitled "Foreign Affairs: Vietnam's Coming Crunch."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THERE IS NO SANCTUARY (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—The official policy of the United States is that our bombers are now free to attack the bases of any planes that intercept our fliers in North Vietnam, even if those bases are inside Communist China.

"There is no sanctuary," the State Department spokesman said, for any planes getting in the way of our planes, and this is interpreted officially but privately as meaning that our pilots are free to pursue the enemy planes no matter where they go and hit their bases if necessary.

This puts China and the Soviet Union in an interesting position. They are allied to North Vietnam and have promised to furnish whatever aid is necessary to defend that country from attack. They insist we are the aggressors in North Vietnam just as we assert North Vietnam, with Soviet and Chinese help, is the aggressor against South Vietnam.

OUR SANCTUARIES, TOO?

In this situation, does the doctrine of no sanctuary work both ways? If we are free to attack their bases, are they then free to attack ours? The answer to that here is: "Let them try." For this Government is confident that it can wipe out all the planes in North Vietnam and in China too if the Chinese really commit their air force to the battle, leaving China and North Vietnam with nothing but the most massive armies in Asia.

Nevertheless, the risks are increasing just the same. They are not increasing because the United States is now flying closer to the China border. Actually, the U.S. Air Force and Navy were flying many more sorties high up into the northeast corner of North Vietnam before the bombing pause than they have been doing in the last few days. The risks are increasing because the new Mig-21 fighters promised by Moscow to North Vietnam are now entering the battle.

Officials here say privately that they do not know where these Mig fighters are based. They think in North Vietnam rather than in China, but they are not sure. The "no sanctuary" statement out of here was clearly intended as a warning to Peking not to assume that we would not follow them to their bases wherever those bases proved to be.

This danger used to deter officials here. For a long time President Johnson, who was approving all the bombing targets in North Vietnam, insisted that our bombers stop short of the effective flying perimeter of the Mig-17's and Mig-19's.

Gradually, however, deeper penetrations of our planes, were authorized not only into the Hanoi-Haiphong area, but north of there to hit the two main supply lines out of China into North Vietnam. The objective was to strike the narrower top of the Communist supply funnel rather than the broader bottom of the funnel below Hanoi.

For some months now, however, U.S. intelligence sources have reported that North Vietnamese pilots were being trained both in Communist China and the Soviet Union, and that the Mig-21's apparently promised to North Vietnam during the visit of Alexander Shchepin last winter were beginning to arrive in the Hanoi-Haiphong area.

Nevertheless, the raids north of Hanoi-Haiphong continued and are now meeting not only increased ground-to-air missile fire but air-to-air missiles from the Mig-21's.

THE UNKNOWN FACTORS

The risk now is not what is known but what is not known. We do not know who is flying the Mig's—the North Vietnamese, the Chinese, or the Russians. We cannot count on the markings on the Mig's, and we certainly cannot be sure that China will stand aside and allow the new Mig's to be destroyed or stay out of the war if we attack their "sanctuary" in China.

This is not regarded at the Pentagon and the White House as an unacceptable risk. In fact, our air power has run into so little opposition in the past that the men running the war from here have gradually come to believe that China and the Soviet Union will tolerate military defeats the United States clearly would not tolerate itself.

WHAT ABOUT SUBMARINES?

In short, we are assuming we can attack their sanctuaries and that they will not or cannot attack our sanctuaries in Saigon, or on the U.S. aircraft carriers in the China Sea; that the Russians will give North Vietnam Mig's and let them be destroyed, but that they will not give them submarines to carry the battle under the sea; that we are free to hit their bases anywhere in any country and that they will leave our airbases alone in Thailand.

Maybe these assumptions are right. The Chinese and the Soviets have been very cautious and have given us the freedom of both the skies and the seas so far, but if there are now to be "no sanctuaries," this could be a very dicey business.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: VIETNAM'S COMING CRUNCH (By C. L. Sulzberger)

SAIGON.—The Armed Forces have little intention of relinquishing control of South Vietnam's Government without a struggle. They contemplate creating their own party to present candidates for next September's Constituent Assembly. By this device Premier Nguyen Cao Ky hopes to get himself voted back into power in national elections.

All this emerges in a conversation with the frail, wiry air vice marshal who runs this tortured land. It indicates another, almost surely unavoidable clash between the ruling generals' junta and venerable Tri Quang's Buddhist activities. Ky is already dealing with Tri Quang's rival, venerable Tam Chau, in a clear attempt to split the opposition.

NO DEAL WITH BUDDHIST

Ky speaks about his tough plans with deceptive gentleness. His bland manner and well-cut blue suit belie his martial mustache and usual taste for gaudy uniforms. He denies he has struck any bargain with Tri Quang.

"I have made no deal," he says. "I haven't seen Tri Quang during the crisis. Why. I only met him once in my life—10 months ago. But the Buddhists have no reason to continue a fight. When we signed an election decree satisfying the aspirations of the majority of the people, that included them. If they continue fighting they will put themselves in a weak and wrong position."

NOT FACE BUT NEED

Ky confesses his government has been unable to "entirely reestablish" control over the dissident area of Hue and Da Nang, where Tri Quang's following is strong. The Premier intends to move further, for, he says: "This is not a question of face but of necessity. I have information that Vietcong agents have penetrated extensively, above all in Da Nang. They have infiltrated the 'struggle committee.'"

"We must weed them out. We have offered an amnesty to the Buddhist demonstrators. I promised this to Tam Chau. But we must weed out the Communists. And we cannot pardon criminals—like those who killed."

April 27, 1966

The Premier professes not to worry about any Buddhist pressure for peace at any price. If they demand this, he argues, they will lose popular support. Furthermore, he claims, it is the Communist infiltrators who are responsible for the secession movement around Hue and Da Nang. Da Nang is the danger point.

But to regain the upper hand in that city, headquarters of General Thi's former I Corps, he will not restore to Thi his old command. He has offered Thi a chance to talk it over in Saigon. But Thi won't come.

So Ky works to consolidate his own position. He plans all measures to prevent intrusion of Communist in the forthcoming Constituent Assembly. "All measures" and "Communists" are words capable of broad interpretation here.

Ky says the armed forces now consider it a necessity to form their own political party soon because we have to elect good nationalists. Ky has no illusion that this can be a majority party, but thinks no faction in the scheduled assembly can gain that status. He wants the armed forces party to be "a stabilizing element."

KEEPING POLITICAL POWER

Finally, it is evident Ky is shedding the pretense that he expects to yield political power and resume his military command. "Personally," he says, "I would prefer to give up office. But my person is not free. It belongs to the people. I may have to continue. I think it is a necessity for the nation."

So there it is, a dangerous doctrine: the familiar thesis of the indispensable man. Ky sips bitter tea and peers through the window of his Prime Ministerial palace, protected by redbereted tommygunners. A helicopter squats in the courtyard.

A DUBIOUS FORMULA

Three things are evident. Ky is going to try to split the Buddhist opposition while moving against autonomous movements in Annam and ferreting out Vietcong infiltrators. He will attempt to build an armed forces political machine. When this is done he intends to offer himself as the only leader who can prosecute the war.

It would be insanity to imagine that Tri Quang, giddy with recent success, will commend this formula to his own Buddhist flock. And so, as the war grinds on and monsoon clouds mount overhead like leaden mushrooms, the political crunch shapes up. There seems slight room for compromise between Ky's stubbornness and Tri Quang's ambition.

CONTINUATION OF NEW HAVEN PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the decision which was made by the Interstate Commerce Commission to continue the New Haven passenger service.

Mr. President, I think this represents an extraordinary breakthrough in recognition of the public responsibility of a great Government agency. We are often in the position where we criticize the Government agencies. Here is a case in which a very fine understanding of the public interests has been manifested by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The ICC has also allowed one of history's greatest mergers, that of the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads. This decision is understandable if we are to make progress in modernizing the great railroad systems. But also it is concerned with public interest. It would have been an adverse effect to have allowed the discontinuance of all New Haven service. It has called

for a continuation of the commuter service within the auspices of this merger—a service which is so vital for the economy and the individual commuters who are involved.

Now—with the cooperation of the Federal Government—I rise to give appropriate credit to the wisdom and sensitivity of the public interest shown by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

HEIRLESS PROPERTY SETTLEMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President. In 1962, the Congress enacted Public Law 87-846 authorizing the distribution of \$500,000 resulting from the sale of World War II vested enemy alien property to settle claims to heirless property of victims of Nazi persecution. These funds have been distributed to both Jewish and non-Jewish organizations in accordance with the law. I have the last report of the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization dealing with the distribution of \$500,000 allocated to it under Public Law 87-846, and I ask unanimous consent that the report be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH RESTITUTION SUCCESSOR ORGANIZATION,

New York, N.Y., April 15, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are pleased to advise you that the distribution of the \$500,000, awarded to the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization, pursuant to Public Law 87-846 was substantially completed. The report which follows shows that \$442,000 were actually disbursed by March 31, 1966, for relief, rehabilitation and resettlement programs benefiting victims of Nazi persecution who settled in this country.

Agudath Israel World Organization, New York, \$50,000.

The above sum was allocated toward the cost of establishing a housing project for elderly Nazi victims. The organization acquired a suitable building in Manhattan which is currently being refurbished. The care and maintenance of the property has been assured by the sponsoring organization. Catholic Relief Service—National Catholic Welfare Conference, New York, \$50,000.

This allocation was reserved for one-time rehabilitation grants for needy and handicapped Nazi victims, with grants not to exceed \$1,500 per family; \$10,000 was spent to assist individuals in meeting special medical expenses.

Nehemiah Robinson Memorial Scholarship Fund, New York, \$100,000.

This fund was established in memory of Dr. Nehemiah Robinson, who devoted a great part of his life to the cause of compensation for victims of Nazi persecution. The fund is being administered by United Help, Inc., in New York, a social agency serving exclusively the needs of Nazi victims in the United States. Scholarships for vocational and professional training are awarded to Nazi victims who have completed their secondary education.

From the inception of the program the fund has expended \$34,854, of which \$30,679 was spent for grants and \$4,175 for loans.

From the inception of the program the scholarship fund assisted 70 undergraduate and 9 graduate students. Scholarship applications originated in over 20 different States of the Union. Recipients of grants

are studying at more than 30 different institutions of higher learning.

United Help Service, New York, \$100,000.

The above sum was allocated for the resettlement of difficult-to-resettle families outside of New York City through one-time grants not to exceed \$1,500 per family. This program is being carried out in cooperation with the local Jewish resettlement agencies.

From the inception of the program a total sum of \$51,570 was spent; \$11,550 was disbursed in 1964, and \$40,020 in 1965.

Assistance was given to 73 individuals and/or families in more than 25 communities throughout the United States.

United Help, Inc., New York, \$200,000.

This allocation was made toward the cost of establishing a housing project for elderly Nazi victims in the New York area, in which there resides the largest number of Nazi victims in any one city.

United Help has acquired land in Queens, N.Y., for the construction of a 19-story building with 216 efficiency and 72 one-bedroom apartments. The preliminary plans of the architects have been approved in principle by the New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal. After final approval of the architects' plans and construction cost, approval of the project will be sought from the city planning commission and the board of estimate. Construction will commence as soon as all requisite approvals are secured.

It should be noted that more than 1,800 elderly victims of Nazi persecution are on the waiting list for the new apartments.

Sincerely yours,

SAUL KAGAN,
Executive Secretary.

REPORT ON EMERGENCY STRIKES OF THE LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE NEW YORK CITY BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has just issued a report on proposed amendments to the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I find it particularly gratifying that this report endorses two proposals which I have made and which are incorporated in my bill, S. 2797, to strengthen existing laws with respect to national emergency strikes.

First, the report endorses my proposal to allow Taft-Hartley factfinding boards to make recommendations as to the terms of settlement—recommendations which are prohibited under existing law.

Second, the report endorses the provisions of my bill which would extend coverage of the act to emergencies affecting "the health or safety of the Nation or a substantial part of the population or territory thereof." While the report takes no position with respect to a number of other proposals incorporated in my bill, I believe this report is an excellent analysis of the problems involved in national emergency strikes, and is worthy of most serious consideration by the Members of the Congress and the public at large.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

April 27, 1966

[From the Record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, April 1966]

COMMITTEE REPORT—PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY PROVISIONS OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

(By the Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation)

In his state of the Union message, the President recommended that the present national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act be revised. He urged " * * * measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority, will enable us to effectively deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interests."

This committee recommends that the national emergency provisions of the act (29 U.S.C. sections 176-179) be amended to apply to emergencies affecting a substantial part of the population or territory of the Nation as well as to nationwide emergencies and to permit factfinding panels appointed under the act to make recommendations for settlement of disputes.

1. PERMITTING FACTFINDING PANELS TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS

At present factfinding panels are provided for but prohibited from making any recommendations; an injunction prohibiting strikes or lockout during an 80-day cooling off period is authorized. This procedure has proved of value in some instances, but resort has frequently been necessary to pressures for settlement outside of the statutory scheme.

One potent weapon in inducing settlements has been the likelihood of additional legislation if no settlement were forthcoming. Congress has never adopted a general permanent abrogation of the right to strike or lockout in any private industry. Ad hoc legislation has, however, been enacted to deal with specific disputes where other measures were insufficient. The Adamson Act in 1916 mandated an 8-hour day on the railroads and prohibited wage reductions during a temporary period of observation by a commission; 39 Stat. 721 (1916), upheld in *Wilson v. New*, 243 U.S. 332 (1917), and now codified in 45 U.S.C. section 65 (1964). A threatened nationwide railway stoppage in 1963 was dealt with by compulsory arbitration limited to the particular dispute; 77 Stat. 132 (1963), upheld in *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen v. Chicago & N. W. R.R.*, 225 F. Supp. 11 (D.D.C.), affirmed, 331 F. 2d 1020 (D.C. Cir.), cert. denied 377 U.S. 918 (1964).

To date a pattern has evolved of dealing with each situation while leaving the treatment of future crises open. The flexibility of this evolving ad hoc approach would be enhanced if factfinding panels appointed under the Taft-Hartley Act were allowed to make recommendations upon request of the President. Such recommendations may be of assistance to the parties in the settlement of the dispute. When made public such recommendations also tend to impose pressure on the parties to resolve the dispute. While providing for such recommendations is no panacea, it would strengthen the architecture of the present law.

Removal of the present prohibition contained in 29 U.S.C. 179, on recommendations by factfinding panels appointed under the Taft-Hartley Act has been frequently recommended in the past. E.g., Seidman, "National Emergency Strike Legislation," in *Symposium on Labor Relations Law* 474, 478 (Sloenko ed. 1961) referring to the views of Senator Taft; Williams, "Settlement of Labor Disputes in Industries Affected With a National Interest," 49 A.B.A.J. 862, 866-67 (1943); Rothman, "National Emergency Disputes Under the LMRA and the RLA," 15

Labor L.J. 195, 202-04 (1964); Givens, "Dealing With National Emergency Labor Disputes," 34 *Temple Labor Quarterly* 17, 44 (1960) cf. Wallen, "National Emergency Disputes," 12 *Labor Journal* 61 (1961). We approve those portions of S. 2796, 89th Congress, 2d session (1966), offered by Senator JAVITS which are designed to remove this limitation. In addition to recommending terms of settlement, the panel could recommend further procedures to deal with the dispute.

Further steps could thereafter be taken if such recommendations, the 80-day cooling off period and mediation proved unsuccessful. In this context, reliance on possible unspecified future sanctions may in some instances place more pressure on the parties than specific statutory provisions, a phenomenon labeled that of "inchoate law" by Adolf Berle. See Berle, "Legal Problems of Economic Power," 60 *Columbia Law Review* 4, 7-8 (1960); Berle, "Power Without Property," 91-93 (1959). On the other hand, the committee also believes that the President could be given authority in advance to invoke a number of possible procedures should an emergency dispute remain unsettled after 80 days.

2. EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

We also recommend extension of the emergency provisions of the act to emergencies affecting "the health or safety of the Nation or a substantial part of the population or territory thereof" as proposed in section 3 of S. 2797. This position flows from the fact that local emergencies can frequently have a national impact.

The long continuing growth of transportation and corresponding extension of markets and economic interdependence make it certain that emergencies in any significant region of the country will have ever greater national impact as time passes.

Further, local emergency disputes are, of course, as serious for those affected by them as national emergency stoppages are to the country generally. State laws cannot be relied upon to deal with local or regional crises, since State power in this field is seriously restricted by the preemptive effect of existing Federal legislation. *Amalgamated Ass'n v. Webb*, 340 U.S. 383 (1951).

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the committee recommends that the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act be revised (1) to eliminate the present prohibition on the making of recommendation by statutory factfinding panels, and (2) to extend the coverage of the

See Wirtz, "The Choice of Procedures Approach to National Emergency Disputes," in Bernstein, Enarson & Fleming eds., "Emergency Disputes and National Policy," 149 (1955); Cox "The Uses and Abuses of Union Power," 35 *Notre Dame Law* 624 (1960); Kramer, "Emergency Strikes," 11 *Labor Law Journal* 277, 232-34 (1960). One such possibility is the receivership proposal included in S. 2797, 89th Cong., 2d sess. (1966) offered by Senator JAVITS. Also of interest in this connection is the idea of economic sanctions against the parties without a stoppage, discussed in Marceau & Musgrave, "Strikes in Essential Industries: A Way Out," 27 *Harvard Business Review* 287 (1949); Goble, "The Nonstoppage Strike," 12 *Current Economic Comment* 3 (1950); Gregory, "Injunctions, Seizure, and Compulsory Arbitration," 26 *Temple Labor Quarterly* 397 (1953); McCalmont, "The Semistrike," 15 *Labor Law and Labor Relations Review* 191 (1932); cf. *Wall Street Journal*, p. 1, col. 1, May 20, 1964 (non-stoppage strike procedure agreed upon in collective bargaining).

provisions to emergencies affecting the health or safety of a substantial part of the territory or population of the Nation.

Respectfully submitted.

William J. Asaacson, chairman; Irving Abramson, Jerome H. Adler, Albert X. Bader, William J. Brennan III, John D. Canon, Samuel J. Cohen, Wilbur Daniels, Richard A. Givens, Alex J. Glauberman, Richard N. Goldstein, Robert C. Isaacs, Isadore Katz, Samuel M. Kaynard, Arthur Mermin, Francis A. O'Connell, Jr., Benjamin C. Roberts, Edward Silver, Donald W. Smith, Burton B. Turkus, Stephen C. Vladeck, John Whittlesey, Benjamin Wyle, William A. Ziegler, Jr., Max Zimny, Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation.

GROWING CONCERN ABOUT ALCOHOLISM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a growing concern is being manifested throughout the Nation with respect to America's fourth greatest health menace, alcoholism, a menace which costs U.S. industry some \$2 billion annually and takes even a greater toll among its victims and their families. Indicative of this increasing sensitivity to the problem are two recent editorials which appeared in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*; they are appended hereto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks two editorials from the *St. Louis, Globe-Democrat*.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, Apr. 8, 1966]

PENNYWISE, POUND FOOLISH

The Federal Government, which puts the proverbial drunken sailor to shame when it comes to flinging billions in largesse overseas and wasting other billions on domestic boondoggles, spent less than \$7 million last year in the fight on alcoholism, the Nation's fourth-ranking health problem.

In terms of dollars and cents, the cost of alcoholism in crime and highway accidents alone is incalculable, certainly vastly more than the pittance spent to combat it.

The incidence of alcoholism in this country is second only to that in France, points out Dr. Robert H. Felix, dean of St. Louis University's Medical School, "but the kind of alcoholism most prevalent here makes ours the worst problem in the world."

Noting that America has more than 5 million confirmed alcoholics, Dr. Felix told a meeting of the St. Louis council on alcoholism that the national crime and divorce rates, poverty and juvenile delinquency among the children of alcoholics are "significantly magnified by this illness."

Money alone can't solve this or any other problem in human behavior. But it can help put a substantial dent in it by providing for programs aimed at restoring alcoholics to useful citizenship.

[From the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, Apr. 9, 1966]

SICK, NOT CRIMINALS

Eighteenth-century London's Bethlehem Hospital lives in infamy in the word it gave the language—"Bedlam." Caged there like wild beasts, victims of mental illness were

April 27, 1966

country share in this excitement. The stirring cry, "Gold in California," galvanized a people into action in 1849 and set this Nation in movement and challenged the spirit of adventure in hundreds of thousands. But the promises of wealth and adventure contained in that cry are nothing compared to the potential wealth of human genius, creativity, and talent that will be turned up and made available to the Nation and to all civilization as a result of the efforts now underway to eradicate poverty in America. It is impossible to estimate the wealth of dynamic energy, talent, wit, and wisdom now latent in these 32 million people who have been designated as "poor." The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has set in motion the greatest gold rush in the history of man. At last this country has discerned where her true riches lie.

There is a different kind of "new awareness" in the country. It will also be an ally in the attempt to solve our environmental crisis. It is the awareness that too much has been destroyed, too much has been wasted, too much has been allowed to deteriorate and fall into ruin, too much was badly planned to begin with. This public awareness is, I believe, now being changed into affirmative action.

A third vital factor that will figure in a solution to the crisis is the leadership that the present administration is giving. The Congress demonstrated courage and boldness in writing, "It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation."

Now, having pointed out some positive assets available to men who want to be a part of affirmative action, let me again ask the question, "What can be done about the 'environmental crisis'?" I believe that your role can be major and determinative.

I believe that you can do these things:

1. Support the local community action program in your individual cities and towns. Use your influence to see that the bounties of nature are available to all and by so doing, enrich the lives of the poor.

2. Remove from your advertising the middle-class image of the enjoyment of nature. Our parks and recreational facilities should serve all class levels.

3. Become familiar with the new Nelson amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. The addition to the programs of OEO is aimed at beautification and preservation of our physical environment. By employing the poor and training them to work on creative, beautification projects a service is done both to the poor and to society as a whole.

The war on poverty (which is part of the answer to your environmental crisis) is a different kind of war than any ever fought before—and it calls for a different kind of mobilization. It requires full mobilization of the best brains, the most artistic talents, the greatest engineering know-how that this generation can produce. There is definitely a role for "Parks and Recreation," if you will assume it.

USE OF ANIMALS FOR RESEARCH

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Commerce, I am much interested in the legislation now pending before Congress to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of animals intended to be used for research.

I feel strongly that it is time for Congress to put a stop to the cruelty that unfortunately has been the result of much of the traffic in research animals.

In recent weeks, I have read several well-written, thought-provoking editorials in major newspapers noting the importance of having any regulatory leg-

islation—such as S. 2322, the Magnuson-Clark bill—apply to research facilities as well as to animal dealers.

To exempt research facilities from the provisions of S. 2322 would be to deprive that bill of half of its impact. As the Christian Science Monitor points out:

The laboratories should not be sacrosanct. It is a fallacy to assume that human nature, even on an intelligent and supposedly benevolent level, will always clean its own house without legal prompting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials be printed in the RECORD:

"Dachau, 1966 Style," from the April 5 Evening Star; "Laboratories Not Sacrosanct," from the April 6 Christian Science Monitor; and "Animals Deserve Consideration," from the April 18 Seattle Times.

There being no objection, the editorials ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 5, 1966]

DACHAU, 1966 STYLE

Supplying laboratories with animals for testing has become a major industry. More than 2 million cats and dogs a year, worth between \$30 and \$50 million, are included in the traffic. And Congress has become concerned over how these animals are being treated.

Judging from testimony documented by some appalling photographs, it is high time the public learned what is going on. Children's pets are being stolen to supply the market. Dogs are being jammed into filthy cages, starved and maltreated by unlicensed and unregulated dealers. One physician who has worked in both government and university laboratories estimates 30 to 50 percent of the animals die before they reach the research table.

The irony in all this is that the doctors are pursuing the noblest kind of goal in their experiments, that of scientific knowledge to relieve man's own suffering. But because the scientists resent any kind of Federal intrusion on their research (except large infusions of Federal money), they have formed a strong lobby against pending bills.

As originally written, legislation in the House would have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to issue licenses, impose humane standards on both dealers and laboratories in handling and transporting animals, and would have required them to keep records of transactions, presumably to cut down on the thievery of pets by suppliers.

The bill emerged from committee, however, in a sadly weakened version. Laboratories have been exempted, the bill has been narrowed to include only cats and dogs—although the trade in other animals is important—and the backwoods farmer, just as capable of cruelty and pet-stealing, is to escape all licensing regulation.

So far the Senate Commerce Committee has not acted on the various proposals. It should insist on the original, tough language as embodied in bills by Senators MAGNUSON, CLARK, and SCOTT. These men differ on the degree of penalties for violators, but their goals are essentially alike—to prevent needless suffering by helpless animals. Unless this Senate version prevails in the ultimate showdown with the House bill, the cruel neglect and pet-stealing cannot be wiped out.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 6, 1966]

LABORATORIES NOT SACROSANCT

The public conscience, once aroused, is a powerful force. The American people are

demanding decent treatment for the millions of animals used yearly by experimental laboratories.

A wave of public protest, motivated by recent exposés of shocking conditions on dog dealers' premises, has resulted in a favorable report on the Poage bill. If and when it passes the Rules Committee, it will go to the House for a vote.

However, this bill, in the form in which it was sent to the Rules Committee, differs from the original bill in that it applies only to dogs and cats rather than to all vertebrate animals, and the humane standards apply only to dealers' premises, stopping short of the laboratories themselves.

This represents a trend which should be halted. With the dealers subject to some degree of regulation, the humanitarian aim is only half defined. A powerful segment of research scientists (notably the National Society for Medical Research, headed by Dr. Maurice B. Visscher of the University of Minnesota) objects to any laboratory regulation whatever. This society originally objected even to regulation of dealers and their premises. Such an attitude on the part of responsible scientists is incomprehensible.

Recent hearings have brought out the fact that conditions in the laboratories are often no better than on the dealers' premises. The laboratories should not be sacrosanct. It is a fallacy to assume that human nature, even on an intelligent and supposedly benevolent level, will always clean its own house without legal prompting.

Senate bills S. 3059 (identical with the original Poage bill) and S. 2322 (similar to it) are now being considered by the Senate Commerce Committee. The public should demand that these bills not be lessened in scope, and that the laboratories not be exempted.

The public should also demand action on the Clark-Cleveland bills, S. 1071 and H.R. 5647, which apply specifically to laboratory experimentation.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times Apr. 18, 1966]

ANIMALS DESERVE CONSIDERATION

The Times supports legislation pending in Congress to provide the Secretary of Agriculture with authority to enforce minimum standards of care, housing, and handling of animals used in scientific or medical experiments.

There are bills in both House of Congress aimed at that objective. One is Senate bill 2322, sponsored by Senator MAGNUSON and Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania.

Some scientific groups are making a determined effort to have deleted from those bills all provisions dealing with the actual laboratory treatment of the animals.

But Dr. Samuel M. Peacock, Jr., senior medical research scientist at the University of Pennsylvania, who himself uses animals in experiments, notes that:

"The animal dealer for economic reasons and ignorance will not reform his methods unless he is forced to do so. The research institutions and universities will not improve their facilities unless forced to do so—for basically the same reasons."

Self-regulation by laboratory scientists, Peacock says, is a "farce."

Considerate treatment of dumb animals is one of the most telling signs of civilization. Congress should pass the Magnuson-Clark bill or some similar legislation.

We are assured by those who have studied the issue that medical research would not thereby be hampered.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the Vietnam situation occupies the attention

April 27, 1966

of every American who is concerned with the future of the free world, and deeply troubled, as I am, about the expansion of Communist aggression throughout the world.

I am even more disturbed after watching and listening to the debate, discussions, demonstrations, and apparent differences of opinion which we have seen develop in the past few weeks.

It seems a vocal minority is trying to complicate and confuse our Nation's policy. At times they even seem to drown out the overwhelming support which exists throughout the country for our courageous stand against the Communist aggressors.

To those who would rather see our Nation hesitate or evacuate—perhaps they need a reminder of the determination and will of those who are suffering the most—the Vietnamese people.

This week I received a letter from a distinguished Californian, John Wayne, who is known and loved by millions of people throughout the world. John Wayne has not only distinguished himself in my former profession but also has demonstrated time and time again in deeds and words a dedication to this country and to our Constitution's principles of freedom and justice. He speaks out frequently on political issues and he speaks from knowledge, understanding, and good judgment.

He has written of the sacrifices the people of Vietnam continue to make on behalf of their battle for freedom. His letter is excellent and I wish to call it to the attention of all my colleagues by placing it in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wayne's letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

April 15, 1966.

SENATORS RICHARD B. RUSSELL, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, J. W. FULBRIGHT, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS: May I remind you of some public information? Proportionately, the Vietnamese have lost twice as many fighting men in their battle for freedom as we lost in the Second World War. Not only that, but in the rural villages 20,000 leaders, mayors, etc., and their families, have been tortured and murdered by Communist guerrillas, yet in each instance someone else has had the bravery to step forward into their shoes.

Imagine the equivalent percentage of our leadership being murdered. That would be around 250,000, which would be enough to include every mayor, every Governor, every Senator, and every Member of the House of Representatives and their combined families. I am quite certain you have information available that makes it unnecessary for me to inform you of the ingenious ways in which they were tortured and killed. This does not sound to me like a people unwilling and uninterested in their fight for freedom.

May I remind you that there were as many people involved in the Watts riot in one section of just one city of our country as were incited in the whole country in Vietnam to parade against its present government. Please don't let our leadership's memory be so short that we forget that the man who is now inciting these people was the same so-called Buddhist monk whose brother is

high in the Communist leadership. Of course, we have no proof that he is a member of same, but it was the machinations of this man that caused us to forsake the Diem government. If we don't back the opposing leadership to this rabble-rouser, if we forsake these people, a blood bath of two million souls is a certainty. A defeat and retreat in Vietnam would lose the respect of all free nations and completely destroy what is left of the once highly respected American image.

How ridiculous it seems that a group of obviously organized leftist agitators could have such a great influence on the international policy of what is supposed to be the most important nation in the world. It is as though our august body of the Senate were to bow to the irresponsibility of the Berkeley beatniks.

I pray, sirs, that you review these facts before you make any decisions that will bring this guerrilla-type warfare any closer to our homes. If they are successful with this method in Vietnam, I remind you that there is a man named Che Guevara who is now presumably training hard-core Communist guerrillas in different parts of South America for the same type of harassment to responsible government.

I also pray that you review these facts before making any statements that might damage our Government's present policy and destroy the freedom which is being bought by the blood and lives of the people of Vietnam, the United States, and her other proven allies.

Sincerely,

JOHN WAYNE.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN BANKING AND ENGINEERING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there are many problems and many approaches to their solutions connected with life in the perilous world we live in today. It is in this context that Mr. D. G. Volkert, of Washington, viewed the challenges facing the banker and the engineer in an article printed in the American Banker last week.

Mr. Volkert, an engineering consultant, writes of the need for continued cooperation between these two great professions, banking and engineering, to help build the world we seek. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the American Banker, Apr. 18, 1966]

BANKING AND ENGINEERING TODAY FACE BIGGER CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

(By D. G. Volkert, president, David Volkert & Associates, Washington)

It is a stimulating but perilous world we live in, an environment of turmoil and of violent dimension—where change and constant crisis seem to have become a way of life.

Confronting us are the three great phenomena of our time: Communism in its many forms; the rising extremes of nationalism in the developing areas of the world, and the astounding explosion of science and technology which has brought us to the edge of space.

To further complicate matters, all three are interrelated and happening at the same time. It is within this environment that the challenges—and the opportunities—facing the banking and engineering professions have never been greater.

Historically, our professions have had a phenomenal impact on the social and eco-

nomic development of man. Furthermore, the physical achievements of construction and design for which we, as engineers, have received great plaudits were, more often than not, made possible through support of banking houses.

The city of Venice owes much of its important construction to assistance extended by the Banco della Piazza di Rialto and the Banco Giro.

The Bank of Amsterdam made possible much of Amsterdam's lasting structures and also extended credit to the Dutch East India Co. for development of these islands' raw materials.

Earlier, the Medicis of Florence and the Fuggers of Germany, while largely interested in other areas of financial endeavor, made significant sums available to cities of that day for design and construction. These, in turn, became major business centers.

Similarly, in more recent centuries, the banking and engineering professions have worked together to provide the ways, means, and know-how which enable a town or country to obtain a much-needed school or hospital; another area to benefit from a dam for power and water conservation; a state to realize various undertakings ranging from highways to the development of industrial and recreational facilities.

The mutual efforts of the planner who envisioned the project, the engineer who determined its physical requirements, and the financier who estimated the economic characteristics all are combined to form the basis for a final decision concerning feasibility of the project.

Today the supply and demand for funds in engineering projects continues to mount.

As engineering consultants, we are called upon by bankers and those in Government and private industry for professional opinions on the need and feasibility of undertaking projects which are designed to raise our standard of living; increase our modes and paths of transportation; aid a friendly nation to achieve better living conditions; attain other goals which ultimately can lead to a better world.

Thus it is that the rapport between our two professions, so long established, has been maintained. Each profession—banking and engineering—has a necessary service to offer the other.

How then do we cope effectively with the three great phenomena of our age?

In the face of the first of these—the Communist threat—our job is to insure that we use our great fund of scientific and technical knowledge more effectively than our opponents use theirs.

Next, with our country facing uncertainties and difficulties brought on by the emergence of new nations all over the world, we must use our technological skills to show others the way to a high standard of living and political stability.

Finally, the engineer is part and parcel of the current revolution in science and technology—a revolution so new that, of all the men who have ever been trained in these fields on both sides of the Iron Curtain, it is estimated that 9 out of 10 of them are alive today.

It is necessary to turn the test-tube discoveries of science into usable products, tools, and processes that serve mankind. Today, it must be done faster than ever before.

Multimillion-dollar Government and privately sponsored research programs have helped to produce scientific knowledge on a scale we've never seen before. We must be ready to exploit new developments and techniques to the fullest.

It is not only our domestic economy, but also our national security that demands that we be able to convert raw discovery into planned perfection as quickly and efficiently

conscienceless dealers who steal and maltreat animals. The public voice on this subject is testimony of the fact that we as a nation are mindful of the rights not only of mankind but also of the defenseless and inarticulate creatures of the animal world.

OUR VIETNAM POLICY

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it has often been stated that one of the purposes of our Vietnam policy is to prove to Red China that aggression, exemplified by "wars of national liberation" will not work. The assumption of such a statement, of course, is that the Vietnamese Communists are the lackeys of the Chinese, without independent national goals of their own. This is an assumption open to serious question, especially in view of the North Vietnamese delegation's attendance at the 23d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party—an international Communist meeting which the Chinese themselves vituperatively spurned. However, if one accepts this assumption the next obvious question is whether our policy is proving what is claimed it proves. An article appearing in the March 28 Evening Star concludes that the very opposite is the case. Since it is most important that our actions at least be fitting to our stated aims, I would like to include the full text of the article as one deserving thoughtful study:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 28, 1966]

DIVIDENDS FOR COMMUNIST CHINA

(By Clayton Fritchey)

If, as the administration insists, both North Vietnam and the Vietcong are under the thumb of Communist China, there is little or no prospect of a negotiated peace, for, as matters stand, China has everything to gain and little to lose.

The United States is supposedly "containing" China, but in reality China is rapidly expanding both its economic and nuclear power (which is all that matters with a modern power), while at the same time bleeding and depleting the United States at an ever increasing rate, and at no cost to itself.

It is one of the most unfavorable positions the United States has ever found itself in. The huge, expensive military effort in Vietnam is, in the final analysis, primarily aimed at China, but so far it has cost China nothing of consequence, and probably won't unless the conflict escalates into a world war.

This side of that eventuality, Peking can keep on draining the United States indefinitely at no sacrifice to itself. The war in Vietnam has been escalating for 5 years, but all the Chinese have contributed so far is mostly encouragement to Hanoi and the Vietcong. Up to now, the war has cost Peking no casualties, and little in the way of supplies except relatively insignificant quantities of small arms and ammunition. For years the Vietcong was largely equipped with captured or surrendered American arms.

So now while China sits watchfully, but safely, on the sidelines as the fighting mounts in Vietnam, how is the United States faring? The answer is that American casualties are steadily rising, and no doubt will increase as more U.S. troops are poured into the battlefield.

The Chinese know, of course, that the defense budget exceeds \$60 billion; they know we are alarmed over inflation, and are soon going to have to raise taxes on everybody. It is no secret that the war has bitterly divided the American people, and that its rising cost is beginning to injure the domestic economy.

Another dividend for the Chinese is the division between the United States and many of its allies and friends over the Vietnam policy, especially among such Asian powers as Pakistan, India, and Japan. Even more important to the Chinese is the way Vietnam has chilled the detente between Russia and the United States and prevented a united front against her.

Military observers here and abroad also are fearful that Vietnam is distorting our military posture around the world. "The Nation's armed services," newspaper correspondent, Hanson Baldwin reports, "have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere." Gen. James M. Gavin also feels the United States has become so "mesmerized" with Vietnam that it has permitted the commitment there to become "alarmingly out of balance." Defense Secretary McNamara, however, firmly denies this.

There is no doubt, though, that China is profiting from the foreign reaction to U.S. policy. General de Gaulle, who is determined to remove France's forces from NATO, charged that American involvement in local conflicts was a danger to Europe. Because of escalation, he said, Europe could find itself drawn automatically into such a conflict unless she managed to have a European strategy of her own as distinct from the strategy that the United States now imposes on her through NATO.

Another depressing factor is that the United States will have to go it alone on any new escalation, for most of our allies do not intend to share the cost either in money or men. In fact, instead of joining us in isolating China, they are now stepping up trade with her. Just recently, West Germany and a European consortium agreed to finance a new steel plant for Peiping.

In the face of all this, the President can only promise an increasingly painful war for the foreseeable future. Since this costs China nothing, why should it encourage Hanoi and the Vietcong to negotiate? After all, China has suffered setbacks everywhere else in the world during the last few years, so why should it try to bring to an end the only success it has going for it?

HOUSE SHOULD ACT ON ETHICS LEGISLATION

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is again very puzzled and shocked about the recent disclosures concerning the personal and political finances of a member of Congress.

Right or wrong, whatever the facts develop, this situation is highly embarrassing to every member of the House and Senate, and I am sure the careful and unbiased deliberations by the Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct will result in a fair decision to the persons involved and the public interest.

Since I entered Congress in 1949 I have worked for a code of ethics for all Government employees which had the teeth of enforcement and a positive deterrent

to abuses. In 1958 a number of us were successful in enacting a code of ethics for Government service which includes all Government employees, including members of Congress and their staffs. But this code of ethics does not have sufficient teeth to back it up. It is a set of principles to live by in our work for the public interest. It was a difficult bill to pass, even without adequate teeth.

During the Senate Rules Committee hearings in 1964, considering the case of the former secretary to the Senate majority leader, I urged the committee to adopt legislation which I have pushed for many years in the House. I am proud to say that my idea to establish a policing body in the Congress was adopted at least in the Senate. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky was successful in his efforts to set up a Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct, which I presented to the Senate Rules Committee.

Today, I am calling for speedy action on three legislative proposals in the field of ethics, which I have worked on over the last decade. I list them here and urge that the House give serious attention to the adoption of the proposals to prevent abuses of the Code of Ethics for Government Service:

First, House Joint Resolution 36, to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government. This Commission would have investigative powers and would advise senior officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of breaches of ethics for appropriate disciplinary action.

Second, House Resolution 18, to establish a House Committee on Grievances. This committee in the House of Representatives would be authorized to require Members of the House to make a full and complete disclosure of his personal income and investments, and would have investigative powers leading to recommendations for censure, expulsion, impeachment, or prosecution in case of wrong doings. I have joined other Members of Congress in filing a statement of assets with the Clerk of the House.

Third, H. R. 9626, a bill to tighten the lobbying laws by turning over the administration of lobbying procedures and reporting to the Comptroller General of the United States, to enforce the lobbying law, which is not now being done.

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE PLANTS

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of millions of people all over the world are suffering from malnutrition—famine threatens in India and uncounted numbers go to bed hungry each night. Millions of children in underdeveloped areas suffer from a disease known as kwashiorkor, a severe form of protein deficiency. It is painful and debilitating and is a major cause of death. If these children could have adequate protein in

their diets, this dread disease would vanish.

We in this country are nearing a technological solution to a large portion of this problem in our development of fish protein concentrate. This powdered extract from fish is 80 percent protein, and it can be produced for about 13 cents a pound. The product does not spoil. It is odorless and tasteless and therefore can be combined with flour to make bread or added to soups or cereals. It can be made to taste like eggs, meat, or virtually any desired food. A mere million tons could fill the annual protein requirements of 100 million people.

Fish protein concentrate, or FPC as it is called, could well become a major part of the world's food supply. It can be made from the many species of fish that are now little used because they are too bony or otherwise inappropriate for human consumption. Moreover, the total world fishery resources are at present underutilized. For example our own coastal waters are yielding about 5 billion pounds of fish though they could sustain an annual yield of 28 billion pounds—a more than fivefold increase. If we can get fish protein concentrate into large scale production, we can not only perform an important service to the world, but we can also give a boost to our fishing industry. Moreover, we have a balance-of-payments deficit in fishery products at this time of \$500 million a year, and fish protein concentrate could help to right that situation.

This entire question is one which has long been of particular concern to me. In 1961 I visited Peru and Mexico to see some of the scientific work being done there with fish protein concentrate. I saw firsthand some of the remarkable results this protein rich food supplement can produce in starving children.

It has been nearly 5 years since my visit and I am still coming to Congress to ask that something be done. The program has been set back enormously by an absurd statement of the Food and Drug Administration in 1962 which termed fish protein concentrate unacceptable on esthetic grounds because it is made from whole fish. This statement has served to discourage much of the potential industrial growth in the production of fish protein concentrate as well as to make it virtually impossible to send it abroad to the hungry nations of the world. It is very poor public relations to give anyone food we will not eat ourselves.

Today the prevailing view is that this opinion of the FDA was irrational since we eat whole sardines and oysters without even processing or purifying them. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has been developing several processes and doing carefully controlled bacteriological and toxicological analyses simultaneously. The Bureau has submitted at least one of the methods to the FDA for approval but we have yet to hear their decision. We are hopeful that at long last the response will be favorable. We cannot afford to wait much longer.

Before this country can really get into large-scale production of fish protein

concentrate, however, engineering and economic feasibility studies must be done. Therefore I am filing a bill today to provide for the construction and operation of sufficient number of pilot plants to test the different processes for production of fish protein concentrate and to take into account types of fish and their availability in different areas. My bill, unlike others that have been filed, does not set a limit on the number of plants because I wish to assure adequate authorization for enough plants to test all methods of producing fish protein concentrate. Probably about five plants would be required eventually, each costing about a million dollars.

Naturally each time a process is ready to be put into pilot plant production, the Secretary of the Interior would have to come to Congress for the appropriation. And the total funds for plant construction would not be requested all at once, but rather over a period of several years, as laboratory research is completed on the various processes.

A number of possible methods of fish protein concentrate production exist, which fall into the basic categories of biological, chemical, and physical. Moreover lean and fatty fish may well require radically different reduction methods. We will not be able to determine the most economical methods until the pilot plants have been in operation. Therefore, in the interest of economy we must give them all a chance.

It may be asked why the Government should invest in plants as opposed to private industry carrying the ball alone. I have given considerable thought to this problem because my inclination would be to keep the Government out of this potentially profitable enterprise for industry. However, we are not dealing here with a simple problem of a commercial enterprise. We are also dealing with a question of international politics. Recently I made a tour of Russian fishing and oceanographic facilities for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and there is not any doubt in my mind that the Russians could easily preempt the fish protein concentrate field if they decided to do so. The state of their technology in fish protein concentrate is similar to ours. They produce large quantities of fish meal for fertilizer and animal feed. Moreover, their fishing industry is expanding rapidly—250 percent since 1953. They would probably have little trouble bringing in the necessary increased catch. If they did so we might lose a valuable tool in international politics. This then is another reason for urgency beyond the purely humane considerations we might have in supplying fish protein concentrate to protein-starved nations.

A pilot plant is not, by its very nature, an economical operation, and unfortunately, there is little indication that private industry is prepared at this time to undertake the major investment in large-scale research which would be required to determine which is the most economical method of producing fish protein concentrate. The bill I propose would limit Government participation to

a maximum of 10 years from the date of the act. By that time all plants would have to be phased out.

Rapid development of fish protein concentrate is demanded by the world situation. The unnecessary delay that we have had should give some urgency to this project. The bill, incidentally, would call for an appropriation over several years of only a few million dollars. This may well be compared with the three and a half billion dollars that have been requested for the coming year alone in agricultural subsidies for products that will be sent abroad.

My bill differs from other bills that have been filed here in that it provides that fish protein concentrate will be eligible for distribution under the provisions of the Food for Freedom Act. Other bills refer to Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress. This statute is due to expire soon and probably be replaced by the food for freedom program. Fish protein concentrate must be included in any food assistance program for it to have its maximum value.

I feel strongly that passage of this bill would produce a great deal of benefit per tax dollar expended, in terms of international good will, improving our balance of payments and boosting our fishing industry. These are all worthwhile investments which, I believe, will pay off in the long run.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1965

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the April 26, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee a policy statement regarding H.R. 10065, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965, was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the Record the complete text of this statement.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1965, H.R. 10065

The Republican Party and the Republican Members of the House of Representatives stand second to none in their dedication to the cause of civil rights. Year after year, our actions with respect to strong and effective legislation have more than matched our words.

It may be that full and complete hearings would indicate that certain changes in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 should be made. However, we question the advisability of considering this particular bill at this time. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act did not go into effect until July 2, 1965. The only hearings on the broad and sweeping provisions of H.R. 10065 were held almost simultaneously in June and July of 1965. At that time the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission clearly did not have sufficient experience under the new act to testify with any real authority. And yet, to date, no additional hearings have been scheduled or held. Certainly, guesses and speculation are no substitute for experience and facts.

This bill would transform the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission into an

project of the magnitude of Hanford, and in case some of the doubters who thought in 1962 that it could not be done are still around, I want to thank Owen Hurd and the rest of the Washington Public Power Supply System people for making it possible for me to say, "I told you so."

While the Hanford plan had some enemies, it had some very good friends, including President John F. Kennedy, who supported the project through the summer of 1962 and signed it into law in September of that year. A year later, President Kennedy personally visited the Hanford site, waved an atomic wand, and started an unmanned crane which moved the first shovelful of earth for the project's construction. It was proud to have the privilege of being with him on that occasion.

Hanford will provide many benefits to the Pacific Northwest and the Nation, in addition to the supply of low-cost power which is its primary purpose. It can serve as a technical training ground for nuclear powerplant operators and technicians of the future; it can demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale nuclear units in integrated, predominantly hydroelectric system.

Not the least of its benefits will be the sense of pride which the American people can feel in this plant, the largest nuclear powerplant in the world.

And I personally take a good deal of pride in prudent management of resources, which I believe is involved in this development of economical electric power, using byproduct steam—a resource which almost was wasted.

Hanford has demonstrated a new kind of joint action in the electric utility industry and, although it is not in itself intended as a model for other developments—involving as it does a unique situation—I believe it does indicate that there are many types of agreements and arrangements which can be called into use where there is determination to get a job done.

It is perhaps the resourcefulness of the Hanford sponsors which offers the best model for future joint efforts by utilities which involve Federal, non-Federal public, and private power entities. New techniques and mechanisms will be needed as our electric industry becomes more and more interconnected and interdependent, and the Hanford project has indicated that it is possible to develop arrangements which protect all parties concerned—and this includes the American consumers, who are most directly concerned of all.

(Mr. PRICE (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the first unit of the Washington public power supply system's Hanford steamplant began producing power on April 8. It was a milestone event in a decade-long struggle to put waste heat to work at AEC's new plutonium production reactor.

If any single Member of Congress deserves credit for this achievement, I believe that it is the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of

the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, CHET HOLIFIELD.

CHET HOLIFIELD, believed in the dual-purpose concept of Hanford. He encouraged the technical and economic studies which were necessary to insure its feasibility. He stimulated the interest of others in this worthwhile project. He fought for the conservation principles involved. He laid his reputation on the line to secure congressional approval. He never gave up in his efforts to secure authorization.

This month's production of power at Hanford is, in a way, a personal accomplishment for CHET HOLIFIELD. He helped engineer this project in the areas where the problems were the most difficult. He succeeded in convincing a majority of his colleagues that he was right, and he got a number of them to actually change their minds in the face of previous record votes.

Hanford is in large measure a monument to CHET HOLIFIELD. Because of his continuing, and unrelenting work, it is today a reality.

The two units at Hanford have a combined capacity of 800,000 kilowatts during the use of the AEC's new plutonium production reactor for the production of weapons grade plutonium and other products. Should AEC decide not to continue use of the new power reactor for such purposes, Washington public power supply system would lease the new power reactor and continue its use for the production of power, in which case the output would be increased with a power only capability of 860,000 kilowatts.

Although nuclear plants with a greater capacity than the Washington public power supply system Hanford steam plant are planned, it is expected that its distinction as the world's largest will be retained for several years.

The modifications and additions to the AEC convertible new power reactor to achieve optimum power production have been made by Washington public power supply system at a cost expected to exceed \$12 million and at no expense to the Government. In addition, Washington, public power supply system purchases the waste byproduct heat from the new power reactor. Steam payments by Washington public power supply system to the AEC will amount to \$30 million in the first 10 years of dual purpose operation and \$6.7 million per year thereafter.

The Hanford steam plant transmission lines required for integration with the Northwest power pool and new power reactor additions and modifications were financed by a Washington public power supply system \$122 million revenue bond issue secured by contracts with both Northwest public and private power distributors. Through exchange arrangements with the Bonneville Power Administration, the power output of the Hanford plant has resulted in an addition of 900,000 kilowatts of dependable power to the region and will exceed 1 million kilowatts during new power reactor power-only operation.

Hanford is an outstanding example of cooperation of Federal and local public

agencies which has achieved many benefits to the Nation, the region, and the local community through utilization of an energy resource which would have otherwise been wasted.

The people of the Hanford area, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation, owe CHET HOLIFIELD a debt of gratitude for his statesmanlike activities on their benefit in generating the support necessary to bring into being this worthy project.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 74 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea."

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess a special subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services made an on-the-spot inspection trip to the combat fronts of Vietnam. I had the honor to be chairman of that group, which included the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS]. Our visit was directed by the distinguished chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], in line with a continuing policy of our committee to keep ourselves fully and currently informed of the progress of all our military activities in Vietnam. Specifically, Chairman RIVERS requested our subcommittee to pay particular attention to our river patrols, our barrier patrols, the development of port and airfield construction, troop morale, the adequacy of equipment, ammunition, and clothing, and any research and development projects that ought to be accelerated to meet urgent needs of our forces in Vietnam.

Carrying out Chairman RIVERS assignment, our subcommittee left Friendship Airport on Thursday, April 7, and returned to Dulles in the early hours of April 19, having spent slightly more than 10 days on our journey. Of those 10 days, 4 were spent in South Vietnam, 2 in Thailand, and the remaining 4 in transit to and from southeast Asia. Because of the political demonstrations that had been taking place in parts of South Vietnam before we were scheduled to leave, Ambassador Lodge expressed some concern about the safety of our group and suggested that the visit might be

benefits, conserve wasted energy, and enhance the important fishery resource.

Today Hanford is a reality because of this unified effort aimed at insuring that a national resource was not wasted.

Washington columnist A. Robert Smith summed up the story following congressional approval, and concluded:

The moral of all this is probably that the Northwesterners, working with bipartisan cooperation, won out in the end because they showed political craftsmanship of a high order and resisted all temptations to stand up and beat their breasts indignantly about the terrible forces arrayed against them.

The triumph of the Hanford project was probably the best example of legislative statesmanship affecting the Northwest since Congress enacted the Alaskan statehood bill 5 years ago.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the authorization and construction of the Hanford project—the world's largest nuclear powerplant—is an achievement of significance not only for the Northwest but also the Nation.

President Kennedy recognized this fact when he signed the AEC authorization bill in 1962. A strong supporter of the Hanford project, the President noted during the White House ceremony the action of Congress making it possible for steam produced at AEC's new plutonium production reactor to be transformed into electricity and distributed to the homes and factories of the Pacific Northwest. He stated:

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that a way has now been opened for the efficient utilization of this energy resource for the benefit of this growing region. To have permitted this resource to be wasted would have been in conflict with all principles of resource conservation and utilization to which we are committed.

President Kennedy pointed out to those present at the White House that Hanford represents a project for peacetime application of atomic energy. And he said:

It will give the United States a freer margin for superiority in the peacetime use of atomic energy. I think it will benefit, in that way, the entire country, north and south and west, so I want to compliment those Members of Congress and the Joint Committee and the Interior Committee and others who have played an important role in the great passing of this legislation. I particularly congratulate CHET HOLIFIELD and Senator JACKSON for their part in this effort.

What are the benefits of the Hanford project? President Kennedy summed them up when he declared:

The proposal of the Washington public power supply system to utilize the Hanford steam for the production of power presents an opportunity, clearly in the public interest, to obtain the maximum benefits from the public investment already committed for this facility and to demonstrate national leadership in resources development while furthering national defense objectives.

The President declared:

The arrangements contemplated by this legislation will provide assurance that the

interests of taxpayers, consumers, and other producers of electric power will be adequately protected.

Enactment of this legislation is a highly significant achievement, and the Members of both Houses of Congress—in particular the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—are to be congratulated on the success of their unremitting efforts to bring about the utilization of the major national resource represented by the byproduct energy of the Hanford reactor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the complete text of President Kennedy's remarks be incorporated in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Hanford is a notable landmark in the history of conservation of energy. It will be remembered in the same way that Bonneville and Grand Coulee are remembered—as part of the continuing struggle to insure that our national resources are put to their highest use. I am proud to have played a part in making the Hanford project a reality.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON THE SIGNING OF H.R. 11974, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION 1963 AUTHORIZATION BILL (HANFORD REACTOR)

I am pleased to sign H.R. 11974, the Atomic Energy Commission 1963 authorization bill.

One portion of this legislation—for which we have waited for quite some time—will make it possible for the steam produced by the Hanford new production reactor to be transformed into electricity and distributed to the homes and factories of the Pacific Northwest.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that a way has now been opened for the efficient utilization of this energy resource for the benefit of this growing region. To have permitted this resource to be wasted would have been in conflict with all principles of resource conservation and utilization to which we are committed.

This project is for peacetime application and atomic heat for electricity which will produce a million kilowatts, approximately. It will be four times larger than any other project in the world. It will give the United States a freer margin for superiority in the peacetime use of atomic energy. I think that it will benefit, in that way, the entire country, North and South and West, so I want to compliment those Members of Congress and the Joint Committee and the Interior Committee and others who have played an important role in the great passing of this legislation. I particularly congratulate CHET HOLIFIELD and Senator JACKSON for their part in this effort.

As I stated in my letter of July 13, 1962, to Chairman HOLIFIELD, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the proposal of the Washington Public Power Supply System to utilize the Hanford steam for the production of power presents an opportunity, clearly in the public interest, to obtain the maximum benefits from the public investment already committed for this facility and to demonstrate national leadership in resources development while furthering national defense objectives.

The arrangements contemplated by this legislation will provide assurance that the interests of taxpayers, consumers, and other producers of electric power will be adequately protected.

Enactment of this legislation is a highly significant achievement, and the Members of both Houses of Congress—in particular the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—are to be congratulated on the success of their unremitting efforts to bring about the utilization of the major national resource represented by the byproduct energy of the Hanford reactor.

Congratulations to all those involved.

(Mr. ULLMAN (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the completion of the Hanford powerplant here today, I am sure that many Members of the House are remembering the long and discouraging struggle which preceded the authorization of this project.

A good many of us recognized the need for some practical application for the vast quantities of steam which would be produced by the Atomic Energy Commission's new production reactor, which was authorized in 1958. In the process of splitting the atom, this reactor creates enormous quantities of heat which represents raw energy.

It was proposed that this steam be utilized in a new, Federal steam generating plant, to be operated in conjunction with the reactor. When sufficient support for a Federal plant could not be mustered in the House in 1961, it appeared that the steam would simply be dumped into the Columbia River—a waste of raw energy of enormous proportions.

The members of Washington Public Power Supply System, all operating public utility districts, came up with their plan to build the Hanford project, pledging their own funds and credit, in order to use this waste steam for a constructive purpose. Certainly all of us here in the House owe a debt of gratitude to these progressive and public-spirited utility operators.

Next, the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), gave its active support to the proposal. With the economic feasibility of the plan firmly established by studies conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, Hanford supporters went to work to win the approval of Congress.

Most of us remember the many rollcall votes on the Hanford issue here in the House, as the Senate continued to support the project and the House failed, by small margins, to vote the necessary authorization. The tug-of-war continued during the long, hot summer of 1962 and it was not until September of that year that the House approved legislation permitting AEC to enter into the proposed contract with Washington Public Power Supply System. The legislation stipulated that 50 percent of the project's output should be offered for sale to private utilities and 50 percent to public agencies. Although some of the private utilities, nationwide, fought the authorization of Hanford while it was in Congress, it is gratifying to know that the utilities of the Northwest have joined the effort by agreeing to purchase a portion of the power output. Not all of the private utilities seem to believe that public power is poisonous, at least not after it has been purified by being intermingled with the private variety which they themselves produce.

It took a great deal of courage for a group of 16 public utility districts, some of them quite small and serving sparsely populated areas, to undertake a

postponed until conditions had been stabilized. Chairman RIVERS, however, felt that the visit was most essential if the full committee was to discharge its constitutional responsibilities properly, and arrangements were finally worked out so that the subcommittee concentrated its attention entirely on military activities in the field and completely avoided both Saigon and Da Nang.

During the course of our 4 days in South Vietnam we traveled partly by plane but mostly by armed helicopter. We visited all four major Vietnamese Army Corps areas, two special forces camps, three separate American Army divisions in the field, including one that was then engaged in jungle combat operation, inspected a major portion of the area being held by Marine Corps forces, inspected the brilliant South Korean combat division now fighting in Vietnam, spent a night on board the carrier *Enterprise*, inspected the huge American supply base at Cam Ranh Bay, visited six major tactical airfields, including the field at Tan Son Nhut the day after the recent Vietcong mortar attack, accompanied the Navy and the Coast Guard on a demonstration of river patrol tactics, spent one night with American troops in the field while artillery shells whizzed overhead, and visited a major field hospital.

During this period we also conferred with two Vietnamese corps commanders, and one Province chief, with the assistant commander of the Republic of Korea's crack Capital Division, with three American division commanders in field command posts, with the general in command of our military supply operations at Cam Ranh Bay, with the deputy commander of all our air operations in Vietnam, and with the admiral in charge of our Navy carrier operations. We also conferred in the field with Lieutenant General Walt, commander of the Marine Amphibious Force, and visited several Vietnamese hamlets in company with him. General Westmoreland came from Saigon to the Bien Hoa Air Base to confer with us for more than 2 hours. On the way out to Vietnam we met for 2 hours in Honolulu with U.S. Pacific Commander, Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp and his full staff.

In Thailand we met with Gen. Joseph Stillwell, commander of the Military Assistance Command, Thailand, and with the U.S. Ambassador to Thailand, Mr. Graham Martin, the U.S. Ambassador to Laos, Mr. Richard Sullivan, and the U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines, Mr. William Blair. In Japan on the way back we also met for an hour with Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer. Besides these individuals the subcommittee talked with a large number of American soldiers, sailors, and airmen of all ranks, as well as with Vietnamese military and civilians, in various locations and assignments.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been happening in recent weeks in Vietnam, and judging from what has been said here in the House and in the other body, these events have caused some concern as to our position in Vietnam. Without going into all the details of the various matters

on which our subcommittee has been asked to report in detail to Chairman RIVERS and the members of the full committee, members may find of interest some of the general observations and conclusions which our group arrived at as a result of our rather extensive survey of Vietnam.

I think I speak for all the members of our group, Mr. Speaker, in saying that we have come back from southeast Asia tremendously impressed with the progress of the fighting there and with the prospects for achieving a satisfactory solution to our problems there.

The war in Vietnam is going very well indeed, much better in fact than most of us realize in just reading the day-to-day press accounts. We have been losing sight of the forest for the trees, I am afraid. We have had our attention called to one specific battle after another. But we have been missing the most essential news, which is that our forces are giving an excellent account of themselves, and have clearly begun to break the back of the Vietcong aggression in all parts of South Vietnam. The area controlled by friendly forces has dramatically increased. The oil spots are very definitely spreading. Many of the highways and other lines of communication are now being opened up. What is even more important, the vast underground network of tunnels and hidden sanctuaries, even ringing the capital at Saigon, from which the Vietcong have operated with impunity for years, is now being successfully broken up and disrupted by the aggressive, persistent, and increasingly by more shrewd and ingenious application of American and allied military power.

Make no mistake about it, we certainly can win this war in Vietnam and we are winning it. And I am convinced myself that we will win it a whole lot sooner than many of us now think possible. There are, of course, enemy sanctuary areas that have not yet been penetrated. There may be more enemy attacks to come. The infiltration routes from the north have not yet been fully interdicted. We may even need still more American troops to wind up the job more quickly. But it is now perfectly clear that our forces have largely taken over the initiative. We are building up the steady momentum of victory. The enemy's elaborate military organization has been seriously disrupted. We must certainly make sure that we press this present advantage fully and quickly through to a successful conclusion. Let us make clear our view that the Vietnam war is not, as some have suggested, an open-ended situation in Vietnam. We are not the French in Vietnam and the sooner we realize that fact the better. Our position is vastly better than theirs.

Contrary to popular impression, the Vietcong forces are not just a ragtail outfit of poorly armed and poorly equipped soldiers, carrying only a rifle and a small bag of rice. These forces are carefully organized, very fully supplied, mostly with Red Chinese and Soviet weapons, even carrying several changes of uniform or disguises. They are supported by vast underground stag-

ing and rest and rehabilitation networks. In these tunnel structures are located elaborate military hospitals, with top-grade surgical instruments, and even printing presses for turning out propaganda material. But we have met this force, Mr. Speaker. And we are today outthinking and outguessing them, even at their own special game of guerilla warfare.

One of the items on which Chairman RIVERS asked us to report specifically, was the adequacy of our equipment in Vietnam. To answer this question we visited our major supply bases at Cam Ranh Bay and we questioned almost every officer or man we met on the matter of shortages. We have been hearing a lot lately, Mr. Speaker, about possible shortages in Vietnam. Let me say that our committee, searching as carefully as possible, could find no serious shortages in Vietnam, none certainly that have impaired our combat capabilities or washed out combat missions. On the contrary, our supply situation is moving along with amazing success. A few months ago ships were backed up for weeks waiting to come alongside to be unloaded in Cam Ranh Bay. The day we were there there was one pier berth actually unoccupied at the base. As anybody knows who has had any practical experience with warfare, you cannot always put your hands, at every moment in every possible location, on all the items you might like to make use of. Some things run out more rapidly than others, and have to be resupplied. You may find yourself using one kind of ammunition more rapidly than some other. Vietnam is no exception to this rule. Some items have occasionally been in short supply in some locations. But these shortages have only been temporary. The problems have been mostly in distribution or unloading. Adjustments have occasionally been made, and schedules, shifted around but the job has continued. What was truly amazing to the committee was the remarkable speed with which we have built up our supplies to the present level so as to support a vastly increased troop commitment. This has been another remarkable American achievement, and we can be justly proud of it.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the problem we face in Vietnam is not exclusively a military problem. The military aggression of the Vietcong, masterminded and directed from North Vietnam, must be broken as we are now in the process of breaking it, with increasing speed and effectiveness. But South Vietnam will not be completely free and secure until an orderly society can be created there, and a start made on building a stable economy and political structure. This is the "other" Vietnamese war to which Vice President HUMPHREY has recently referred. How did our subcommittee find that other war progressing?

Clearly, it will take a longer time to win this other, nonmilitary war. The problems which face any South Vietnamese Government are monumental, as indeed they are in almost any other Asian nation. The jobs to be done in

ending poverty, improving education, wiping out disease, creating an effective working democracy are indeed staggering in their scope. Headway is being made in this war, too, but it will not be completely won this week or this year, or perhaps for many a year to come.

But it was the firm impression of our subcommittee that there has been a tendency here in America to overlook the clear distinction that exists between the military operations against the Vietcong, now progressing so successfully, and the longer, tougher, essentially civilian job that lies ahead of building, indeed, creating, a free society in Vietnam. Because the problems of building this free society almost from scratch are so obviously vast and could take so long to solve completely, we have been inclined to think that the war itself is equally interminable, something that could possibly go on and on for years without any end. That, our subcommittee believes, is a serious and dangerous mistake to make, one that could undermine the support which our forces in the field deserve to have from us back here at home.

As I have already said, we believe we can win the military war in the foreseeable future. This will not, of course, automatically solve all the remaining questions of public order, economic prosperity, and representative democracy. But it is not correct to suggest that until all those problems have been solved the military victory itself cannot be won. If the American people can understand that the military war, in which we are primarily involved, is being won and that our fighting men need not be bogged down indefinitely in Vietnam until the last economic and political problem has been solved, then I believe they will be far more willing to give our commitment there the fullest and most enthusiastic support.

In the military war our forces are taking, as I have indicated, an increasing share of the leadership and responsibility, with the results we have already noted and with a successful conclusion, the so-called light at the end of the tunnel, clearly in sight. But when it comes to the other aspects of Vietnam—maintaining local security and order, building a successful economy, establishing a working democracy, then we can and must look primarily to the Vietnamese forces and people themselves to take over the major burden of the job. Of course we will have to continue to help them in this. But we should also be able to look toward other agencies, the United Nations perhaps and other Asian countries, Japan, for instance, that has had such dramatic economic success, giving South Vietnam substantial help and assistance.

I do not think we need to be too disturbed at the prospect that it could take some time before all of these security and economic and political problems are solved in Vietnam. After all, even here in America we have not entirely solved our problems of poverty and general education. And there are still American cities in which one cannot feel completely safe and secure walking down the street at night.

At the present time American forces in Vietnam are engaged chiefly in search-and-destroy missions against the Vietcong. We sweep through an area and rout out all the Vietcong personnel and installations we can find. But because of limits in the total personnel available, we cannot remain indefinitely in all these areas—not just searching and destroying but also clearing and holding, as it is called. Thus when our forces finally do pull out, we can expect that the Vietcong may move back into the searched area and constitute a renewed threat. Does this mean then that we face an impossibly revolving threat which can only be fully countered when there are enough forces available to us to sit indefinitely in all key areas in South Vietnam? We do not believe this is the case. Combat commanders reported to us that once an area has been subjected to a thorough search-and-destroy operation, even though friendly forces might later move out of the area, the nature of Vietcong activity thereafter does not revert to the same level as before the initial search-and-destroy activities were undertaken. And the extent of Vietcong aggression can be further reduced by maintaining systematic patrolling in these areas.

This would suggest therefore that once the Vietcong aggression has been crushed, it will be possible to snuff the burden of local security, of holding the areas that have been once cleared of Vietcong, to the Vietnamese forces themselves. Eventually this shift could also mean a substantial shift in the character of our own military commitment in Vietnam, as we move from purely military operations to the longer jobs of "pacification" or "rural reconstruction" or "revolutionary development." In that connection we were most impressed with the job the South Korean Capital Division has been doing in this regard. They have done a magnificent fighting job. They are also doing a magnificent job of aiding and assisting the civilians in the area of their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent weeks about the impact of the recent Buddhist riots in Vietnam on our current military commitment. A number of individuals, many of them very distinguished, have been quoted as saying that if the Vietnamese Government asks us to get out of Vietnam then we ought to get out.

In my judgment, we make a serious mistake in talking about getting out of Vietnam, in the light of what necessarily must be at best, very hypothetical circumstances. Talk of getting out is bound to have a defeatist effect, not only on our forces in the field but also on the people here at home. It is especially disturbing to hear it suggested at the very time when our military operations are progressing so successfully.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying how much all of us were impressed by General Westmoreland. He is an outstanding officer and we are extremely fortunate to have him on the job in Vietnam. The high morale of all American troops in his command, the highest perhaps in our military history, is a great tribute to his leadership and

personal dedication to the complex task our country faces there. One occasionally hears disparaging remarks about the nature of the "military mind." Let me say that if General Westmoreland is any example, let's just hope we have a lot more military minds. Here is a man with a firm, clear grasp not just of military matters, but the whole tangled web of interrelated cultural, economic, and political factors involved in South Vietnam.

I also want to add a special word of commendation for General Walt of the Marine Corps. He is a vigorous, inspiring field commander, with the utmost devotion of his troops. His interest in the Vietnamese people is the kind of leadership we need.

After speaking with General Westmoreland and General Walt, our committee came back home with the feeling that perhaps we have been regarding Vietnam too much as a problem and too little as a great opportunity. Here, after all, is a most challenging task, to help a country get on its feet and grow into a prosperous and self-determined democracy, to solve the complex problems that attend the emergence of any new nation, and to use our power and our influence to give freedom one more genuine foothold in the Asian hemisphere. This, after all, is what we in America have always tried to do down through our history, to use our resources and energy not merely to enjoy freedom for ourselves here at home but to help others enjoy the same benefits and privileges we enjoy in other corners of a rapidly shrinking world.

Seen in this light, Vietnam is something that can well call forth the very best in our Nation and in our people, and present a challenge to which we can rise to prove that American ideals and objectives are still more vigorous, more stable, more productive, and more fundamentally rewarding than those espoused by any other form of government in the whole world.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan, a very valuable member of our subcommittee.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would like to say at the outset that I have listened with great interest to what the gentleman from New York has had to say. I feel he has made a very thorough report of our activities during the Easter recess. I would particularly like to commend him for the manner in which he discharged his duties as chairman of our subcommittee. I was proud to be with him on this mission at all times. I would also say not only to the chairman of our subcommittee but with respect to the other members as well that our business was carried on with objectivity and with absolutely no political considerations from the time we left until we returned. As far as this war is concerned, this was not a Republican and Democratic committee out there. This was a red, white, and blue committee visiting our troops in the field.

There are a few things the gentleman from New York made reference to that I would like to underscore. What he has said about the talk we occasionally hear about "getting out" is what I have reference to. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the gentleman's statement. I would say this in addition thereto: While we were in Thailand we talked with our military people there. We were told the situation is growing worse in that country. I am satisfied that we are going to have to face the threat of Communist aggression if not where we are grappling with it now successfully, then later in Thailand. We are told incidents are increasing and terrorist activity is being stepped up in the northeast sector. This is no secret. Those who are bent on expanding communism in this area are going to be continuing their efforts there. This is no time for us to back down and get out. This is a time for us to see this job through.

I, too, was impressed with the morale of our troops. Everywhere we went we talked with our people, and in spite of the heat and all kinds of difficulties and the hardships that our boys were enduring, I felt the morale was high. I was proud of them and every Member of this body and all Americans should be proud of our servicemen who are doing this job and doing it without complaint. It was my privilege to visit Vietnam last year. There has been a tremendous change in this 10-month period. A big buildup has taken place.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we are digging in and that we intend to stay, as the President has said we intend to stay.

I was impressed with what we observed there in connection with the pacification program.

We visited a village with General Walt when sick call was being held in one of the little huts. We saw a line of Vietnamese people waiting to be treated by a medical corpsman who was administering to the ills of the natives of the village.

Mr. Speaker, I was much impressed with our efforts and feel that these programs must continue to have our attention if we are to hold this land. In other words, we must win with the people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word with respect to what the gentleman from New York said about certain shortages here and there. Yes, we did raise this question everywhere we went, because our chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], had directed us to raise this question in all areas we visited. I cannot speak about the areas to which we did not go. I know nothing of what the situation is there. But we were not told of any serious shortages in the areas that we did visit.

However, General Westmoreland did say this in explanation of this entire situation. He said:

About a year ago we had a change in policy. We decided on this buildup.

He said that he needed more troops desperately at that time and that he knew supplies would be inadequate but that he had to take the risk. He fur-

ther said that they had a lot of ships that were backed up in the harbor. He told us that they had to pay demurrage in order to have these floating warehouses which could be utilized if necessary.

So, he described it thusly. He said "for the past year I have been in the business of distributing shortages." But in fairness, I must say that no one at any of the places we visited told us of serious shortages at those specific locations.

There is one other matter I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

After the base at Tan Son Nhut was shelled by mortar fire at 1 o'clock in the morning, we stopped by that same afternoon to inspect the damage.

There were some four planes destroyed. I believe 29 were damaged. Seven of our boys were killed. There were other injuries there too. The oil dump at Tan Son Nhut was a roaring inferno. Flames were blazing as high as this building.

In addition, two of the Blue Eagle planes that were based at Tan Son Nhut had also been hit. As we stopped by our Blue Eagle planes I recognized Lieutenant Commander Henderson who is commanding officer of one of the crews and he invited me to fly a mission with them that evening.

These Blue Eagle planes are the airborne television platforms that we have in Vietnam at this time. After I came back from my first visit to Vietnam a year ago and at the urging of some of our very highest ranking officers in Vietnam, who told me they felt that the television concept was one that would be of great assistance to our effort there, I made some inquiries as to the status of this project. It was quite difficult. The USIA did not want to tell me anything about it. I wrote several letters. Finally I had to make a speech on the floor of this House. I had to get the assistance of my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], before I could get the classified information on the television studies that had been made. But we finally got them. We determined that it was sound. I wanted to do whatever I could to push it and so did several of my colleagues.

When we met with Ambassador Lodge before he went to his second assignment, we told him of our interest in this and our desire to help if we could. He sent us a cable after he had been out there 3 or 4 weeks and said that the program had been reviewed and approved and we were going to go ahead with it.

During the Christmas holiday I visited the Blue Eagles at Andrews Air Force Base where they were being fitted out. They are Constellation planes. There is nothing in them but electronic gear for television and radio transmission. So because of my longstanding interest in this project, I was terribly disturbed to find that one of our Blue Eagles had taken a direct hit at Tan Son Nhut. The starboard tail had been knocked off and it was also hit on top of the fuselage. The other plane had 40 shrapnel holes in it.

The boys were there and they were ready to fly it; and I went with them.

We flew over Saigon for 5 hours in a tight circle 8 miles in diameter transmitting television signals to the ground simultaneously on two channels—channel 9 for the Vietnamese and channel 11 for our American troops.

I would say that one criticism that we heard in many places where we saw television sets was that the movies were too old. I do think something should be done about this and I intend to pursue it.

But with respect to the Vietnamese language transmission on the Blue Eagle, I would just like to take a minute to tell my colleagues about the content of this program. The news program told the people what had happened that day in Vietnam. I saw B-52's on the television screen dropping bombs. I saw General Westmoreland making a statement for the Vietnamese people. I also saw General Taylor on television. On the same program I heard some Vietnamese music. They had a humorous show, something like a Bob Hope show. Then they also had a magic act that was done very well.

But I would say this about the political difficulties we are having in Vietnam—if that Government is unstable it is because the people are not informed. They do not know what is going on in their country.

This struggle, in its final analysis, is nothing but a struggle for the minds of men. We in this country have the greatest potential for reaching the minds of men of any people anywhere in the world.

We can help to get a message to the Vietnamese people about this war through this medium.

But we must do more. One of our planes is grounded. We have only one that is flying now and it is on a limited schedule. So it will not be long before I will come to my colleagues of the House with some recommendations for more and better equipment. If it is worth doing, it is worth doing well. We should have first-class equipment. We should have planes that fly higher and planes that we can base in remote areas.

As far as cost is concerned, the whole project so far has not been more than the cost of one B-52 raid. We have just put up \$12.3 billion on a supplemental request. We have tried everything. Things have not been working too well, and that is why we are in the trouble we are in today and why we are having to send more troops to Vietnam.

I say that this is worth trying, and it is my hope that we shall have the support of Members of the House in doing so. I feel confident that my colleagues on the subcommittee will fully realize the value of this program and will also be giving it a push.

There are many other things we could comment on, but I do not want to encroach further upon the time of my colleagues.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of our subcommittee for the manner in which the business of our subcommittee was conducted.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for his generous remarks and assure him I am certain that the members of the subcommittee

April 17, 1966

will support him in his recommendations with regard to the Blue Eagle Project.

I wish to yield to the distinguished chairman of our committee, but I do not want to do so without first expressing to him, not only on behalf of myself, but all members of the subcommittee, our appreciation for making it possible for us to see the fighting fronts in Vietnam as representatives of a distinguished and able committee.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from New York and thank him and his subcommittee for taking time from their justified recess at Easter, at great sacrifice of time and energy, to make this trip. I have listened to most of what the gentleman had to say this afternoon. I was interrupted for a couple of telephone calls. But his report is fascinating, and I am sure it will receive wide approval. I look forward to the full report, which the gentleman will render to the full committee.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], and each member of his committee deserve the thanks of the House and of our committee and the country for the fine effort they have made and the very compelling and requiring schedule that they have had to fulfill. I look forward to this report. But at this time I wish to congratulate him on an excellent report, and also to congratulate each member of his subcommittee. I have been rewarded by taking time to be present this afternoon, and I wish to thank you for what you have said and what you have done.

To each of you I say you have made a great contribution to your country and you deserve the thanks of this Congress and the Nation.

Mr. STRATTON. I wish to thank the distinguished chairman once again for his very generous remarks.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California, a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this time to commend the gentleman from New York on the very scholarly manner in which he has presented, I believe, most of the thoughts which the committee has synthesized of our views on South Vietnam.

Some of these views we have exchanged in aircraft and on the sea, and so on. But by and large we have kept pretty well together.

The message we bring back to the people of the United States is that we have a different kind of show going on in South Vietnam today than we had a year ago. A year ago we had some 20,000 troops that were supporting. Now we have a quarter of a million troops, and we are still supporting them. We are supporting the people of South Vietnam in their efforts to keep free and to have their own self-determined program in that area.

I had much serious trepidation when I went to South Vietnam, representing

the great, liberal area of California. I suspected many times that perhaps there was much more sympathy in the south with some of the socialistic programs than actually was the case. We have determined by our on-the-spot investigation that there is a strong feeling among the people of Vietnam that they do not want occidentalism, they do not want communism—they do want to get rid of their poverty, but they want to do it their way.

That is the message that we got in Thailand. We learned there from General Stilwell that they are making a very impressive effort in that area to resolve their problems. They are upgrading their economy. We know that some of our efforts now in the military sphere are going to have a tremendous fallout, such as the roads and railways we are putting in there, which are going to draw Thailand together and bring the back country to a point where they can enjoy their government services.

It is important that we look at the whole area as a vital cog in the development of southeast Asia. If we keep our commitment with Thailand, we are not going to have the problems that we currently have in South Vietnam. The comments and conclusions with respect to the nonopenhandedness of the South Vietnamese encounter is important for the American people, because there is a \$700 million gross national product economy merging with a \$1 billion gross national product economy. Of course, not to have inflation is impossible in either economy.

But to say that we are going to fight for 20 years in this encounter is not realistic. We still have the greatest military and psychological warfare machine. We have the greatest army in history. I do not think it will take us 5 years, or 10 years, but probably we cannot resolve it in 1 year, either. We are going to resolve it. Our American people must know that.

Our fighting men on the front are going to take cognizance of that. Their morale is excellent. They know who is with them, and who is against them.

At one time perhaps the Vietcong could be farmers by day and soldiers by night, but with the big U.S. presence occupying most of the rice lands and most of the flat areas in the Mekong, and all up and down the coast, the Vietcong have had to determine whether they will be farmers or fighters.

I know we were all pleased to find that many of them were determining of late, about 100 percent, to be farmers. These are what we call the ralliers.

Up in the 2d Corps area, 3,000 came over to the Government in just 3 months of this year. So we have made excellent progress in that area.

At this point I will include in the Record a nonclassified statement prepared by Lt. Col. Richard E. Shade which sets forth in detail our itinerary over South Vietnam:

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1966:

Bangkok to Pleiku, 0620 to 0915 (all times local), VC-54. Met by Maj. Gen. W. O. Kinnard, commanding general, 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile), in behalf of Ambassador

Lodge and General Westmoreland. Went by vehicle to 2d Corps Headquarters (ARVN). Called on Maj. Gen. Vinh Loc, commanding general, 2d Corps Tactical Zone. Briefed by corps advisers, G-2 Lt. Col. Howard R. Ross; G-3 Maj. Arthur J. Wehr, Jr.; G-5 Maj. James R. Bukoski. Colonel Timothy, senior adviser, was absent and was represented by Lt. Col. Robert K. Loomis.

Pleiku to Plei Me, 1055 to 1135; UH-1 (Helo). Accompanied by Maj. Hugh B. Harrison, 2d Corps advisory team protocol, and Lt. Col. William A. Patch, special forces "C" detachment senior adviser in 2d Corps. Met and briefed in bunker in the camp by Capt. William H. Willoughby, Jr.

Plei Me to An Khe, 1155 to 1235; UH-1. Landed at base camp of 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile). Luncheon at commanding general's mess with commanding general, and staff. Briefing—introduction by Major General Kinnard; G-2 Maj. Ephraim Martin; G-3 Maj. Zachary Whaley; G-5 Lt. Col. Monroe Kirkpatrick. Viewed captured equipment prior to briefing. Met constituents after briefing.

An Khe to Canh Van, 1520 to 1540; UH-1. Landed at headquarters, Republic of Korea, Capital Division. Met by Col. Gilbert C. Russi, line officer. Met with ADC, Brig. Gen. Lee Nam Jou. Short honors ceremony extended followed by call on ADC. Briefed on division history and operations in Vietnam by Lt. Col. Suk Ryung. Quick tour of captured equipment.

Canh Van to Qui Nhon, 1645 to 1655; UH-1. Boarded Navy C1A (COD).

Qui Nhon to U.S.S. *Enterprise*, 1700 to 1850. Ship was on "Yankee" station in South China Sea (overflew cruiser firing). Met by Rear Adm. T. J. Walker, commander, Carrier Division 3; Capt. R. W. Rynd, Chief of Staff; Capt. J. L. Shipman, commander, Air Wing 9; Capt. J. L. Holloway III, commanding officer, USS *Enterprise*; Capt. F. S. Petersen, executive officer, *Enterprise*. Supper in the admiral's mess. Briefing by Admiral Walker on Carrier Division 3 operations. Briefing by Captain Holloway on *Enterprise*. Tour of nuclear reactor. Remained overnight.

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1966

Further tour of ship.

U.S.S. *Enterprise* to Chu Lai, 0920 to 1030. C1A. Met at Chu Lai by Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, commanding general, JTFMAC; Maj. Gen. Lewis G. Fields, commanding general, 1st Marine Division; Maj. Gen. Keith B. McCutcheon, commanding general, 1st MAW. Party helo lifted to hill 69, met and briefed by Lt. Col. Paul X. Kelley, commanding officer, 2d Battalion, 4th Marines, and Maj. Ernest L. DeFozio, battalion executive officer. Observed and fired weapons. Chopped to Vinh An No. 2 village civic action project of 1st Battalion, 7th Marines. Col. Loucy N. Dasey, director civil affairs office, and Maj. J. S. Ready, his assistant, met, briefed, and conducted tour of village. Party then went to Logistical Support Unit and had lunch with constituents. Then briefed at MAG 12 by commanding officer, Col. Leslie E. Brown.

Chu Lai to Cam Ranh Bay, 1410 to 1510. VC123. Met and given unscheduled briefing by commanding officer, 12th TFW, Col. Levi R. Chase. Proceeded by UH 1's to Cam Ranh Bay logistical area. Briefed by Brig. Gen. Arthur L. Friedman. Helo tour of entire logistical area and adjacent Army and Air Force facilities.

Cam Ranh Bay to Can Tho, 1750 to 1920. VC123. Met by Col. George A. Barten, SA, 4th Corps. Had extremely informal discussions and remained overnight.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1966

Attended daily staff briefing. Met with Lt. Gen. Dang Van Quang, commanding general, 4th Corps tactical zone. Then briefed by corps advisory staff: G-2 Lt. Col. John W.

April 27, 1966

Goldsmith; G-3 Lt. Col. Alfred G. Hill; G-5 Lt. Col. John V. Swango.

Can Tho to Vung Tau, 0940 to 1015 VC128. Met by Capt. J. T. Shepherd, A.C. of S. for oper., COMNAVV and Lt. Cdr. Donald G. McMillan, senior adviser, 3d coastal region. Went by vehicle to CSC on hill above Vung Tau and briefed. Traveled by vehicle to Cat Lo. Briefed and luncheon. Then boarded river patrol craft and observed firing demonstration.

Vung Tau to Binh Ba, 1310 to 1325, UH-1. Landed at advance field CP of 1st Infantry division. Met by Maj. Gen. William E. Depuy, commanding general, and briefed by General Depuy on the current division operation.

Binh Ba to Jungle Position, 1350 to 1410. Overflew the area where an infantry company had been hit hard 2 days before accompanied by Brig. Gen. James F. Hollingsworth, ADC. Landed in area of 3d Bde. in jungle. Met and briefed by Col. William D. Brodbeck, commanding officer, 3d Bde.; Lt. Col. Lee S. Henry, commanding officer, 1/18 Infantry and Lt. Col. Howard L. Sargent, Eng.

Jungle Position to Phouc Vinh, 1450 to 1535. Landed at Phouc Vinh, 1st Bde., 1st Infantry Division, for fuel but since division had failed to notify that Codel was not to stop there, members went to CP location to visit constituents, accompanied by Brig. Gen. Charles M. Mount, Jr., ADC, and Col. Edgar N. Glotzbach, commanding officer, 1st Bde., 1st Infantry Division.

Phouc Vinh to Tan Son Nhut, 1610 to 1700. By UH-1 party overflew Phu Loi (1st Infantry Division, Artillery) and Di An (1st Infantry Division command post) and landed at Tan Son Nhut (Saigon). Met by Col. George Budway, airbase commander and was briefed and visited the airbase for a survey of the damage inflicted by the indirect fire attack on the base at 130030 April.

Tan Son Nhut to Cu Chi, 1805 to 1825, UH-1. Landed at division command post of 25th Infantry Division and was met by Maj. Gen. F. C. Weyand, commanding general, and members of his staff. Party split into small groups and remained overnight with battalion elements of the 25th Division.

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1966

Party visited in battalion area and was then briefed by General Weyand at 0900 hours.

Cu Chi to Tay Ninh, 0945 to 1035, UH-1. Party had chance meeting with Col. William McKean, commanding officer, 5th Special Forces, at Tay Ninh Airport, and then went to "B" Detachment where briefing was introduced by Maj. Leonard Ochs, commanding officer; S-2 Capt. Howard Holmes; S-3 Capt. Nickolas Gilbert; CA/Psy. Ops., Capt. W. A. Rice. (Tay Ninh just south of war zone "C" which the party was very interested in.)

Tay Ninh to Bien Hoa, 1110 to 1158, UH-1. Party landed at Bien Hoa Airbase and was met by Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, U.S. Air Force, deputy commander, 7th Air Force, and Col. Robert A. Ackerly, 3d TFW Commander, Col. Wiltz P. Segura, 3d TFW XO. Went to refresh. Was joined by General Westmoreland, COMUSMACV, and had lunch at officers' mess with COMUSMACV. Had long discussion with General Westmoreland after lunch.

Bien Hoa to 93d Evacuation Hospital, 1510 to 1520. Met by Lt. Col. Thomas Kelly, hospital commanding officer. Given short briefing and met constituent patients.

93d Evacuation Hospital to Bien Hoa Airbase, 1610 to 1620, UH-1. Returned to airbase and met by commanding officer and staff. Went on short tour of base.

Bien Hoa to Bangkok, 1700 to 2015, VC-123. Party departed RVN for Thailand.

No. 70—21

Mr. Speaker, this indicates that we contacted a considerable number of bases and people of all of the units of the service. Certainly the graphic portion should not, but the written portion should go into the RECORD to show where we went and what we did in Vietnam.

I would like to comment just a word on our pacification program. In a measure, this is a misnomer. This indicates that we go into areas which allegedly are friendly, to pacify them and make them our friends.

I believe the bulk of the people are our friends.

We found that many of the people who have been under Vietcong control want to support the Government. They want protection, but they need a little more know-how—how to develop politically, how to develop economically, how to get Government services, how to provide defense, and so on.

This is what we mean by pacification.

In the Mekong area, the 4th Corps area, where the South Vietnamese were doing the job themselves, with 160,000 ARVN troops, and only 5,000 Americans, we pacified last year more than 600 villages. Our target for this year is more than 600.

As the gentleman indicated in his report, those areas tend to stay pacified. That is good.

I personally talked with Chaplain Riley in the 4th Corps area. He pointed out that he had a tremendous local pacification program. He worked with the Vietnamese, teaching English to the young Vietnamese people and other things. I contributed to his nonprofit organization, which he had going there as a U.S. Army venture separate and distinct from the AID undertaking.

At this time I should like to include in the RECORD an analysis of this pacification program and this separate program going on in the 4th Corps area.

OPERATION EDUCATION FOUNDATION,
CARE OF G-5, ADVISOR SECTION,
HEADQUARTERS, 4TH CORPS, ADVISORY TEAM 96,
APO San Francisco, January 30, 1966.
Subject: Operation Education Foundation.
To: All servicemen

1. This foundation is a nondenominational, charitable, nonprofit organization that is dedicated to assisting the children of Vietnam to obtain an education. The idea of the foundation was formulated by Chaplain Riley, our 4th Corps chaplain with the help and advice of the senior adviser and deputy senior adviser.

2. A constitution outlining the purpose of the foundation and the operational guidelines was drawn up and approved by the MACV Judge Advocate General's office. The primary objectives of the foundation, within financial and material resources available, are:

(a) Provide tuition and other assistance as required to deserving children in order that they may have an opportunity to receive an education.

(b) Supply textbooks and educational materials.

(c) Augmentation of teachers salaries.

(d) Encourage and assist in the construction of new schools, additional classrooms, and educational facilities.

3. Many of the above requirements are met by the various military and civilian agencies now operating in the Republic of Vietnam and by the Vietnamese Government itself. However, many of the children do not have even the basic items of clothing necessary to go to school, and in many instances can not pay the very small fee required for tuition. Others are in areas where teachers and school facilities are not available. It is these groups that the Foundation will assist primarily.

4. For approximately \$5 per month we can pay the tuition and other necessary expenses of keeping a small child in school. As our foundation funds increase (hopefully), we will attempt to assist in furthering the education of young adults.

5. Through the efforts of Mr. Jim Lucas and the attached copy of the article from the Fort Worth Press, Fort Worth, Tex., the foundation has received approximately \$400 from people in Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas. Other contributions have come from members of the 4th Corps staff sections and several of the sector advisory teams. Most of the contributions have been in \$2, \$5, or \$10 donations.

6. Any amount you can give will be appreciated and will help to assure some small Vietnamese child of a better life both for the present and the future. Cash, checks, money orders, or plasters are acceptable. Checks should be made payable to Operation Education Foundation.

7. At the present rewriting of this letter, March 24, 1966, Operation Education Foundation has received approximately \$2,200 through contributions from Georgia, Florida, Virginia, and members of our advisory teams here in Vietnam. We are agreeing to open 10 new schools in Vinh Binh Province in which 600 children will receive an education for a period of 21 months. The total cost will be \$4,600 for teacher training and salaries, and student school kits. U.S. Agency for International Development has provided the new classrooms. Province board of education will provide upkeep, utilities, and exercise supervision, and operational control. The total cost for 600 students for 21 months is \$7.40 per child.

8. Contributions may be made at the pay table or to any of the below listed officers or advisers to the foundation:

Chaplain Office: Chaplains Riley or Campbell.

G-5 office: Lieutenant Colonel Swango, chairman, board of governors.

Signal section: Sergeant Major Montague, vice chairman.

G-3 office: Master Sergeant Robinson, treasurer.

G-1 office: Sergeant First Class Lovell, secretary.

JOHN V. SWANGO,
Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry,
Chairman, Board of Governors.

I also should like to say a few words as to a few conclusions I have made, and comment on some of the things General Westmoreland told us. I was much impressed with this soldier, as were all of the members of our committee. Frankly, I found him to be as much a "dove" as he was a "hawk." He well understood the limitations of his military machine. He understood the importance of developing political integrity within the South Vietnamese people. And I was impressed by his nine rules, which he had prescribed for all of his military personnel, and the fact that he was consolidating his military personnel

April 27, 1967

outside Saigon and outside the major establishments.

The rules go like this:

The Vietnamese have paid a heavy price in suffering for their long fight against the Communists. We military men are in Vietnam now because their Government has asked us to help its soldiers and people in winning their struggle. The Vietcong will attempt to turn the Vietnamese people against you. You can defeat them at every turn by the strength, understanding, and generosity you display with the people.

This little dialog is carried by every member of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam:

1. Remember we are guests here: We make no demands and seek no special treatment.
2. Join with the people. Understand their life, use phrases from their language, and honor their customs and laws.
3. Treat women with politeness and respect.
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people.
5. Always give the Vietnamese the right-of-way.
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill.
7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude, or unusual behavior.
8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege.
9. Above all else, you are members of the U.S. military forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions. Reflect honor upon yourself and the United States of America.

I am satisfied that some people go Communist by a swift coup and learn somehow to live with the system. I also have come to appreciate that in South Vietnam nothing has happened quickly. While the Vietcong use a carrot from time to time, they have the great bulk of the population terrorized in South Vietnam due to the length of the encounter. The fighting Vietcong are highly motivated, great soldiers but their fanaticism at almost all levels has made them much like animals. Whether peace can ever be negotiated with them I think is questionable—I personally believe it certainly is as important to negotiate with the Vietcong as it is to Hanoi—both are equally aggressive and important.

I am satisfied that the war effort in South Vietnam will be larger before it gets smaller; that it is always possible with highly emotional people that a minority element might gain control of the Government by election and ask the United States to leave. I do not think this will happen; that the United States is making steady progress on all fronts, that people are respecting our intentions more every day; that at the current attrition and interdiction rate the Vietcong and North Vietnamese cannot continue their effort. The end I do not think will come in 1 year but it will not be 5 years either.

I am glad to see our efforts at all levels with the people of Thailand. Bangkok is a thriving city; rural development is underway. The war of aggression will be won I think in Thailand before it really starts—by the Thai people themselves.

I am satisfied that we are carrying on a highly sensitive war that could be carried on by a highly nimble and sensitive,

compassionate military establishment. The great bulk of the people of south-east Asia strongly support us, virtually unanimously in many quarters.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate in this discussion. I believe we have a message we can more precisely articulate in a formal report. I hope we can give widespread voice to our views.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from California for an eloquent contribution. He certainly was one of the hardest working and most tireless researchers of the group. I believe that has been reflected by his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the documents referred to by the gentleman from California may be included in the Record at the appropriate places.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the distinguished former Governor of Vermont, a very distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to be associated with the very full report which the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], has made to the House this afternoon.

I concur with substantially all that the chairman has told the House. I think it has been a very good report. In view of the limited amount of time that is left on this special order, I will not attempt to elaborate as to my own views. It was a pleasure to be on this subcommittee and to have this opportunity to see firsthand the development of our military assistance effort in Vietnam in the company of the other distinguished and very pleasant members of the committee. I think no little bit was contributed to the success of our visit to Vietnam by the presence of our escorting officer, Colonel Burgett, who made sure that we got where we wanted to go, and also to the presence of General Grash of the Marine Corps assigned to us as an observer from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Let me say that we did find the airport construction and seaport construction was going along in very good shape and supplies were getting through as needed. There were no significant shortages, as my colleagues indicated, that we found. Morale seemed to be very good. It was my personal impression the limitation of the tour of duty to 1 year in Vietnam was an important factor in the high morale.

We did note at the airports the construction of the steel revetments loaded with earth was a substantial limiting factor in the damage inflicted on airfields and on aircraft by night mortar attacks. This program of revetment construction seemed to be going along pretty well.

Cooperation between the authorities of the Republic of Vietnam's army and our own authorities appeared to be good.

As my colleagues indicated, the war in Vietnam from a military standpoint is going well. We have the initiative. As the distinguished gentleman from California indicated, though, Americans should not think of this war as purely a military effort, because we are truly making a major effort.

Once the Vietcong have been driven out of a village in the area we are making an effort toward the peaceful redevelopment of that village. We are giving the inhabitants medical care and getting schools working again and providing better sanitation practices and restoring local government to them. This is not just a military effort. A major effort is being made to redevelop a peaceful economy and local self-government of the Vietnamese people.

Further I can say that from the observations I made of the Vietnamese in many of their villages and in one or two of their cities, I am genuinely of the impression that they much prefer the presence of the American troops and the authority of the Republic of Vietnam to that of the Vietcong. After all, we are bringing to them medicine and restoring their schools and local self-government and so on. We are not taking things away from them. As things have gone downhill in the defeats of the Vietcong, they have been taking the rice of the Vietnamese peasants and often also impressing the older male children into their armies. So, whenever there is a free choice, I am convinced that the people of Vietnam will prefer the American and their own Government of the Republic of Vietnam on every occasion.

The desertion rate of the Vietcong is increasing. That is a good sign, I think.

Now let me say lastly that my own impression, and I believe the rest of the subcommittee's, was that the fate of south-east Asia, not just Vietnam but Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, pretty much depends on what happens in Vietnam. As we take this thing through, I am optimistic that, as the chairman of our committee has pointed out, we can bring it to a successful conclusion within a reasonable time. Peace and independence can be maintained for the Republic of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Vermont for a very eloquent statement and say that I subscribe wholeheartedly to his comments. It is unfortunate that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not provide for photographs, because I think we could embellish this account with a number of photographs not only those taken by the official photographer from the command in Thailand but also with home movies which the gentleman from California took and which will perhaps be available for showing sometime to Members of the House who might be interested in it and a few slides that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and I took also with our color cameras.

I see the distinguished gentleman from Washington, also a very capable and able member of the subcommittee rising and

April 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8751

I will be very happy to yield to him for such comments as he may care to make.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, you will notice that as we go down the seniority list on this subcommittee the time for talk grows shorter and shorter. Therefore, I shall follow that program and just take a moment or two.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks of my distinguished colleagues and join in the accolades which have been given to our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], and also in his remarks thanking the chairman of our full committee for making it possible for all of us to go to South Vietnam.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks of all of my colleagues who have preceded me.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I can subscribe wholeheartedly to all of the remarks which have been made by the gentleman. However, I want to underscore just two matters which have been referred to by my subcommittee chairman, one having to do with the military mind and to take a moment or two to talk about the demonstrations that have been going on recently in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I think probably I am one who was inclined to feel that the military mind was concerned only with matters purely military. However, I was most gratified during my time in South Vietnam to find that our military, from General Westmoreland right down through the captains in the companies, are genuinely concerned with the pacification or civic action programs. They realize that it would be a hollow thing to chase the Vietcong out and then not do anything about giving the Vietnamese people an opportunity to improve their way of life.

Mr. Speaker, for one to go into these villages—and we were not in the cities, we were in the villages—and see them and smell them permits one to understand that it has been and is a rather hopeless situation under which they live. One can well understand why it has been such a fertile field for the Communists and for the Vietcong. Our people are not only running the Communists, the Vietcong, out of there, but they are showing the Vietnamese people a better way of life and are giving them the opportunity to have a better way of life.

Mr. Speaker, that leads to the demonstrations that have taken place there recently, and that in and of itself proves how well our military effort is now growing, because without our military effort being able to keep the Vietcong off, these people would not be able to demonstrate. What they are doing right now, as was explained to us while we were over there, is to use the demonstrations as their way of political action. The Buddhists are demonstrating in an effort to gain a dominate position in the political hierarchy that will be established when they do obtain a civilian government. It was prophesied to us that the Catholics would soon be demonstrating for the same purpose. Before we were back in this country we heard on the news reports that the Catholics were doing just exactly that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe everything is going as well in Vietnam as we can reasonably expect. We may get to the conference table sooner than many of us had thought, though I doubt that it will happen in the next few months.

I want again to say that I join in the remarks of all of my colleagues who have preceded me and again I thank our chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington for his contribution and thank all of the Members who have participated in this discussion for their contribution, and the cooperation which they extended to me while on the trip.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this was truly a bipartisan or a nonpartisan operation.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who took part in this discussion be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OHIO AND THE CIVIL WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, by 1860, Ohio had reached a population of 2,339,511 and the whole Union, 31,433,321. By any standard, Ohio was the outstanding State in the Civil War as it produced the greatest percentage of the fighting men and a galaxy of outstanding generals. Ohio's adult population numbered approximately 500,000 and the total vote in the presidential election of 1860 was 442,441. Lincoln had carried by a 231,610 to 187,232 margin so there was room to believe that the Union cause might not be widely supported. This was not the case. Ohio contributed statesmen like Salmon P. Chase, Benjamin F. Wade, John Sherman, Edwin M. Stanton. Its war Governors, William Dennison, David Tod, and John Brough, each loyally supported the Union.

Under 10 Presidential calls for troops, Ohio furnished 310,654 soldiers, only 8,750 being raised by draft. More than one-half of Ohio's adult male population tendered their lives to the Union. The famous trio of generals, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan etched records which were without equal. There was also Custer, McPherson, the famous McCook family which illustrated the scythe of destruction that wrought havoc on homes throughout the Nation. A McCook fell each year of the war; father and three sons, three of whom were illustrious generals. All in all, there were 24,591 Ohio soldiers killed or mortally wounded in actual combat. It is noteworthy to point out that 13,354 died of disease in hospital or prison or from exposure or cruel starvation. Medical care was not very far advanced in that war.

The following list of generals gives an

indication of our contribution to the leadership that spurred the Union cause to victory:

OHIO GENERAL OFFICERS, WITH STATE AND DATE OF BIRTH

(The * indicates a graduate of West Point; the † that the officer was major general by brevet, usually for some special gallantry on the battlefield.)

GENERALS

- *Ulysses S. Grant, born at Point Pleasant, Ohio, April 27, 1822.
- *William T. Sherman, born at Lancaster, Ohio, February 8, 1820.
- *Philip H. Sheridan, born at Albany, N.Y., March 6, 1831.

MAJOR GENERALS

- *Don Carlos Buell, born at Lowell, March 23, 1818.
- *George Crook, Montgomery County, September 8, 1828.
- *George A. Custer, Harrison County, December 5, 1839.
- *Quincy A. Gilmore, Lorain County, February 28, 1825.
- James A. Garfield, Cuyahoga County, November 19, 1831.
- *James B. McPherson, Clyde, November 14, 1823.
- *Irvine McDowell, Columbus, October 15, 1818.
- *Alex. McD. McCook, Columbiana County, April 22, 1831.
- *William S. Rosecrans, Delaware County, September 8, 1819.
- *David S. Stanley, Wayne County, June 1, 1823.
- Robert C. Schenck, Warren County, October 4, 1809.
- Wagner Swayne, Columbus, November 10, 1834.
- *Godfrey Weltzel, Cincinnati, November 1, 1835.

MAJOR GENERALS, RESIDENT IN OHIO BUT BORN ELSEWHERE

- Jacob D. Cox, born in New York, October 27, 1828.
- *William B. Hazen, Vermont, September 27, 1830.
- Mortimer D. Leggett, New York, April 19, 1831.
- *George B. McClellan, Pennsylvania, December 3, 1826.
- *O. M. Mitchell, Kentucky, August 28, 1810.
- James B. Steedman, Pennsylvania, July 30, 1818.

BRIGADIER GENERALS OF OHIO BIRTH

- *William T. H. Brooks, born at New Lisbon, January 28, 1821.
- *William W. Burns, Coshocton, September 3, 1825.
- †Henry B. Banning, Knox County, November 10, 1834.
- *C. B. Buckingham, Zanesville, March 14, 1808.
- John Beatty, Sandusky, December 16, 1828.
- Joel A. Dewey, Ashtabula, September 20, 1840.
- †Thomas H. Ewing, Lancaster, August 7, 1829.
- †Hugh B. Ewing, Lancaster, October 31, 1826.
- *James W. Forsyth, Ohio, August 26, 1836.
- †*Robert S. Granger, Zanesville, May 24, 1816.
- †*Kenner Garrard, Cincinnati, 1830.
- †*Charles Griffin, Licking County, 1827.
- †Rutherford B. Hayes, Delaware, October 14, 1822.
- †J. Warren Keifer, Clark County, January 30, 1836.
- William H. Lytle, Cincinnati, November 2, 1826.
- *John S. Mason, Steubenville, August 21, 1824.
- Robert L. McCook, New Lisbon, December 28, 1827.
- Daniel McCook, Carrollton, July 22, 1834.
- John G. Mitchell, Fiqua, November 6, 1838.

Nathaniel C. McLean, Warren County, February 2, 1815.

Emerson Opdycke, Trumbull County, January 7, 1830.

Benjamin F. Potts, Carroll County, January 29, 1836.

A. Sanders Platt, Cincinnati, May 2, 1821.

James S. Robinson, Mansfield, October 11, 1828.

Benjamin P. Runkle, West Liberty, September 3, 1836.

J. W. Reilly, Akron, May 21, 1828.

William Scoy Smith, Pickaway County, July 22, 1830.

Joshua Sill, Chillicothe, December 6, 1831.

John P. Slough, Cincinnati, 1829.

Ferdinand Van De Veer, Butler County, February 27, 1823.

Charles R. Woods, Licking County.

Willard Warner, Granville, September 4, 1826.

William B. Woods, Licking County.

Charles C. Walcutt, Columbus, February 12, 1838.

M. S. Wade, Cincinnati, December 2, 1802.

BRIGADIER GENERALS, RESIDENT IN OHIO BUT BORN ELSEWHERE

Jacob Armen, born in Virginia, January 7, 1808.

Samuel Beatty, Pennsylvania, September 16, 1820.

H. W. Price, Virginia, 1809.

Ralph B. Buckland, Massachusetts, January 20, 1812.

H. B. Carrington, Connecticut, March 2, 1824.

George P. Este, New Hampshire, April 30, 1830.

Manning F. Force, Washington, D.C., December 17, 1824.

John W. Fuller, England, July, 1827.

Charles W. Hill, Vermont.

Augustus V. Kautz, Germany, January 5, 1828.

George W. Morgan, Pennsylvania.

William H. Powell, South Wales, May 10, 1825.

R. P. Scammon, Maine, December 27, 1816.

Thomas Kilby Smith, Massachusetts, 1821.

John W. Sprague, New York, April 4, 1827.

Erastus B. Tyler, New York.

John C. Tibbal, Virginia.

August Willich, Prussia, 1810.

At the close of the war it was only natural that Ohio should take a lead in promoting the new GAR which was organized in Illinois. At one time, 753 posts were in existence but the ravages of time took its toll and little by little the GAR passed out of existence. While on the Ohio scene, however, it wrote a remarkable record of public service and dedication to the veterans' cause.

The first meeting of the Department of Ohio GAR was held in Columbus on January 30, 1867. An indication of their interest was shown in a report issued at the 3d annual encampment held in Dayton on January 13-14, 1869:

It is a humiliating fact that Ohio is behind many of the loyal States and behind many of her sister States of the Northwest, not her equals in wealth, population, and resources, in doing timely justice to her many soldiers' and sailors' orphans, who have a right to demand her guardian care and bounty. Their patriotic fathers laid down their lives a sacrifice upon the Nation's altar, for the benefit of this and future generations, leaving behind them those who by nature's ties were bound to rear and educate until past the age of dependency, and this sacrifice was made by them under the most sacred pledges that could be given by a loyal, patriotic people.

The neglected condition of the soldiers' orphans in Ohio, in many cases left in ex-

treme poverty and often found shelterless and starving in our streets, force them to commit deeds of wickedness that doom them to fill our prisons and penitentiaries. For this the people of the State are by reason of their neglect in a high degree responsible. This charge cannot be laid at the door of any one man but applies to the whole people, collectively speaking. Hence the important duty of remedying this great wrong should be made to devolve on somebody in order that the subject should be fully brought to the knowledge of the people of the State in such way that they can act in the matter in a united manner.

Ohioans did act. On August 19, 1869, Senator John Sherman delivered a dedication speech at the new orphans' home at Xenia. On November 19, 1888, the Soldiers and Sailors Home in Sandusky was opened.

Our own area has a wealth of Civil War tradition. It is impossible to do more than sketch a few items of interest regarding the eight counties of the 17th Congressional District which will serve as a reminder of the contribution and sacrifice of our forefathers.

ASHLAND COUNTY

At the start of the Civil War, Ashland County was the infant among our eight counties now composing the 17th Congressional District. On February 24, 1846, the legislature passed an act creating Ashland County, formed from territory of Richland, Huron, Lorain, and Wayne Counties. When the Civil War broke out the county's population was a scant 1,748. In response to President Lincoln's first call for 75,000 troops this small county responded with one company of Volunteers, led by Capt. John S. Fulton, 1st Lt. Thomas J. Kenny, and 2d Lt. W. B. McCarty.

Most people thought the war would be over quickly and the original enlistments were for 3 months' service. The original Volunteers were attached to the 16th Regiment. Ashland County furnished two full companies of the 84,166 men Ohio furnished under the call of July 22, 1861. Both of these were incorporated into the 23d Regiment, OVI, which possessed the distinction of having two of its officers, R. B. Hayes and William McKinley, become President of the United States.

Two Ashland County companies, C and H, of the 42d Regiment, OVI, served under another future President, Col. James A. Garfield. More realistic this time, the Volunteers were enlisted for 3 years' service. There are many anecdotes about C and H Companies. In a war which was primarily fought by younger men, General Garfield appointed Peter B. Johnson, of Ashland, then over 60 years of age, as trainmaster. He served honorably in that capacity for 3 years.

Ashland County had the unique distinction of having one of its native sons be the first citizen of Ohio to volunteer as a soldier for the Union Army. Lorin Andrews was born in a log cabin, on April 1, 1819 and was of the Horatio Alger tradition. From 1840 to 1843 he studied at Gambier but dropped out due to lack of adequate finances. In 1854 he was, nonetheless, chosen as president of Gambier and the institution advanced

under his leadership from 30 to over 200 pupils. It was in February 1861 that he offered his services to Governor Dennison, believing that war was inevitable. He later enlisted as a private which sparked the enthusiasm of citizens in Knox County. Governor Tod made him a colonel and asked him to raise a company which he did. This company was a part of the 4th Regiment and it was Lorin Andrews' fate to fall early in the war. He died on September 18, 1861, in West Virginia as a result of exposure and typhoid fever. Returned to Gambier, he was buried there at the prime of life, 42, a martyred hero in Knox County.

Other Ashland sons served under another illustrious Ohioan, Hon. John Sherman, of Mansfield, who formed the 65th Regiment OVI which was raised at Mansfield. Col. Charles G. Harker commanded. They trained at Camp Buckingham which was located at Mansfield.

In July and September of 1862 during the scare that Cincinnati would be besieged by the famed Confederate raider, John Morgan, an appeal was made to the farmers and laboring men within a proper distance of the Queen City to aid in its defense. A large number of men from the rural districts hastened to the rescue. On September 2, Governor Tod issued a proclamation authorizing Gen. Lew Wallace to complete the organization and stated that none but armed men would be received. They were called the Squirrel Hunters and defended Cincinnati against a raid that never materialized. Ashland County sent 104 men to this peculiar campaign. By resolution of the legislature in the winter of 1863, discharges in due form were furnished to the Squirrel Hunters of 1862, successors in kindred spirit to the minutemen of the Revolutionary War.

On November 15, 1888, the soldiers' monument was dedicated in Ashland at the courthouse yard. Gen. R. B. Hayes, former President of the United States, delivered the dedicatory address. The inscription is as follows:

GAR posts in Ashland County were as follows:

No. 132, Andrews Post, Ashland.
No. 182, McCarty Post, Polk.
No. 255, Elliot Post, Jeromesville.
No. 278, Armstrong Post, Hayesville.
No. 309, Fisher Post, Loudonville.
No. 356, Fuller Smith Post, Sullivan.
No. 512, Zeigler Post, Perrysville.
No. 569, C. P. Ogden Post, Nova.
No. 607, Smalley Post, Rows.

COSHOCTON COUNTY

President Lincoln's call for troops came on April 14, 1861. Coshocton County gives an interesting illustration of how soldiers were conscripted in the sixties. On April 16, 1861, a meeting was held at the law offices of Nicholas & Williams prior to which A. M. Williams had gone to Columbus and secured a commission to raise a company. Signs went up all over town which proclaimed "Call for a Union Meeting."

This public meeting was held at the courthouse. The Age, Coshocton newspaper of the day, pointed out that immense delegations came in from every part of the county and it became dan-

April 27, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400060002-0 8759

THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

By the flow of the inland river,
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave-grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day:
Under the one, the blue,
Under the other, the gray.

These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat,
All with the battle-blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day:
Under the laurel, the blue;
Under the willow, the gray.

From the silence of sorrowful hours
The desolate mourners go,
Lovingly laden with flowers,
Alike for the friend and the foe:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day:
Under the roses, the blue;
Under the lilies, the gray.

So, with an equal splendor
The morning sunrises fall,
With a touch impartially tender,
On the blossoms blooming for all:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day:
Brodered with gold, the blue;
Mellowed with gold, the gray.

So, when the summer calleth,
On forest and field of grain,
With an equal murmur falleth
The cooling drip of the rain:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day:
Wet with the rain, the blue;
Wet with the rain, the gray.

Sadly, but not with upbraiding,
The generous deed was done.
In the storms of the years that are fading
No braver battle was won:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day:
Under the blossoms, the blue;
Under the garlands, the gray.

No more shall the war-cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red:
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day:
Love and tears for the blue;
Tears and love for the gray.

NO ONE WANTS WAR—MULTER'S POSITION ON VIETNAM

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. KEE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I and several of my colleagues in the New York delegation have recently received copies of the same letter calling upon us to oppose our Government's actions in Vietnam.

That letter reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned faculty members of New York City's Abraham Lincoln High School, submit the following to you for your thoughtful examination:

Neither international law nor moral law supports our position in Vietnam.

Our bombing of a helpless people is an abomination.

Silence against injustice today is comparable to the silence of the German people when 6 million human lives were extinguished in the gas chambers and the crematoriums of Europe.

Many, many thoughtful people are looking to you to help lead our country back to morality and sanity. Open debate on the Vietnam war on the floors of the House and the Senate is long past due. It is time for the elected representatives to do something—whatever is necessary—to stop the horror on the other side of the globe.

In addition, pressure must be applied to our State Department to release all the facts on Vietnam to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, because it is so important that all of our citizens understand why we are in Vietnam and why we have taken the position we have taken, I have written to these well-meaning people in an effort to make my position crystal clear.

My reply was as follows:

DEAR FRIENDS: This will acknowledge receipt of your mimeographed letter, dated March 18, 1966, postmarked April 17, 1966, together with copies of the same letter which have been referred to me by other Congressmen, since your school is located in the congressional district, which I have the honor to represent.

Before attempting to discuss the legal or factual situation, permit me first to emphasize and reemphasize as vigorously as possible my position.

Neither President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, nor I, and as far as I know, no Member of Congress, wants war, limited or unlimited, declared or undeclared.

We want no war anywhere, any place or any time.

We want no war—period.

We want peace.

We want peace for all people everywhere and every place for all time.

We will meet at any time, any place, with anybody to talk peace and without any conditions.

Meeting among ourselves to discuss peace is fine but it does nothing constructive except to let us blow off steam.

If we could arrange to discuss peace with the Vietcong, the National Liberation Front, Hanoi, or Peking, we might accomplish something. I will help expedite the issuance of a visa for anyone who can arrange a meeting for that purpose.

The United Nations and the greatest diplomats in the world, American and foreign, Communist and anti-Communist, thus far have failed. They and we continue to try.

Now let us proceed to put this entire matter in true perspective.

Moral law, American law and international law all demanded that we go into Vietnam and stay there, doing exactly as we are doing, until the people of Vietnam invite us out just as they originally invited us in.

Bibles are the original source of all moral law as civilized people practice it. Bibles include the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Koran and all other similar books, no matter what they are called.

My Bible, like each of the others, teaches: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

All civilization has believed that the word "proclaim" as used there means more than talk about it. It means fight for it not only for ourselves but for all others from whom the aggressor seeks to take it. "Throughout the land" means all the world—not merely America or Israel or Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy.

"All the inhabitants" means just that and not merely the whites or the Jews or the orientals, but all. Domestic and international law are based on that moral law.

That is why the Jews successfully fought off the Amalekites; the Maccabees assaulted and defeated their persecutors; the free world did not submit but beat down the Hitlers of all ages. That is why our fleet defends

Taiwan (Formosa) from the Chinese Communists. That is why we sent our marines into Lebanon. That is why the United States is committed to defend Israel against Arab aggression.

If Nasser attempts to carry out his threat to destroy Israel, will you continue to cry "Peace, peace" or will you insist that the United States send its Army, Navy, and Air Force to protect Israel?

When Hitler was riding high, we talked until we were breathless and to no avail.

When we sent our boys to Europe and the Pacific to prevent further murder and carnage, you shouted more and more and faster and faster.

Which of you cried out against the destruction of Berlin and Hiroshima and the innocent civilians who died then? The more shame for not having done so.

The military facts of life are, however, that to the fullest extent possible we try to spare civilians from death and maiming—but the enemy does not and never has.

Bombing of any people, not only the helpless, is an abomination. We are not bombing civilians. We are bombing a ruthless, treacherous, fighting enemy and its military installations.

More than 1 million North Vietnamese have fled their homes, leaving everything behind, going to South Vietnam for safe refuge from the Communist hordes.

It is the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong, the Chinese Communists, who are mutilating, murdering, and pillaging, not us.

The Geneva Conference provided for free elections in both North and South Vietnam. The National Liberation Front and the Vietcong have thus far prevented such elections.

We have not interfered in North Vietnam because its government has not asked us to do so. Our treaty obligations require us to do just that if requested by a government to help it prevent aggression from outside.

Even if the North Vietnamese revolted against their government and asked us to intervene, we have no treaty obligation to do so.

All we are doing in South Vietnam is—at the request of its duly accredited government—opposing aggression from outside and trying to permit the South Vietnamese to elect their own government.

Once that is accomplished, we will follow the bidding of that government and those people and stay or get out. In any event, once the aggression ceases, we will get out.

All that the U.S. Government has done has been approved by the U.S. Congress, not once but five times, most of the times unanimously and the last time with only 6 votes out of 534 against it.

I have complete confidence in our Commander in Chief, whom we elected as President of these United States and I am sure that he will continue to exert every possible effort to bring about an early peace and that is a peace with honor and dignity, not only to ourselves but to all mankind.

I appreciate having your views and invite you to write me further about this or any other matter.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

AN ANSWER TO THE CRITICS OF FHA

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. KEE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Housing Administration has had its share of critics lately.

The examples being used, the cases in point, have some age on them, but generally center around the late 1950's and

April 27, 1967

the early 1960's. The late 1950's is a particularly fruitful period for those who criticize FHA. And projects in Florida seem to offer them fertile ground for their digging.

The record—and the 20/20 hindsight of the faultfinders—shows why this era and this area were chosen for the point of attack. Florida was overbuilt. The supply was greater than demand, and FHA suffered the consequences.

But it was not alone in bearing the burden of great expectations and medium realizations. The private and conventional mortgage lenders took losses that were as great or greater.

Nor do the critics give any weight—or even recognition—to the fact that the FHA has served well the American public, without cost to the American taxpayer.

Since it was established in 1934, the FHA has helped about 8 million families realize their aspirations for better housing. It has insured mortgages on homes, and served as the catalyst for providing over 1 million units of rental housing.

One has only to contrast the blighted slum area of Southwest Washington of a few years ago with the beautiful apartments and homes there today, to realize what FHA has done. Today's Southwest Washington is made possible by risk—insurance risk by FHA.

My own 13th Congressional District, as well as most of New York City and State, has had its fair share of better family housing because of FHA. We want more of it.

This is part of the total record. If the losses to accomplish this record were excessive, many of us would have reservations about FHA. But the facts are these:

First. The percentage of net loss to insurance written is only slightly over one-half of 1 percent—0.59 to be precise. Do not confuse this with the annual premium. The net loss is 0.59 percent of the gross amount of insurance issued.

Second. The agency is self-supporting and in fiscal 1954 repaid the Treasury for its seed money including over \$20 million in interest.

Third. The FHA now has accumulated reserves in excess of \$1.1 billion to pay for its future losses.

Make no mistake. There will be future losses. The FHA is an insurance operation, and insurance involves risk, or there would be no need for it.

But the stockholders of life insurance companies do not go to the cemeteries and wring their hands with the widows of men under 50 who have died of heart attack.

They look at the net results. This is what we should be doing and we will see that the FHA has helped us to become a nation of homeowners.

This is a public record which we should not permit to be desecrated by any popular horror story which has been produced for public consumption. The record speaks for itself, but it needs to be made known.

Dedicated public service unfortunately does not have the glamour and mass appeal of the stories of wrongdoing and misuse of public trust.

I would like to review some of the specific recent criticisms to illustrate how distorted partial facts can make cases appear. One of the principal target areas is inflated land values.

The critics dote on referring to one example where the land cost \$212,000, and was later valued at \$300,000. What is not mentioned is that the purchase price did not include the cost of the option. Neither does it mention any allowance for interest, taxes, or carrying charges. Furthermore, in that area land values on prime sites were rising. I am told the value was reviewed by the headquarters technical staff who found the value fully justified.

I do want to point out that FHA has taken effective measures to avoid inflated land values in its instructions to field offices.

There have been a good many references to nonprofit sponsors, especially in housing for the elderly. This was a new field in which the Congress directed FHA to help meet the need of housing our senior citizens. Everyone had to learn how to deal with projects of this type. No doubt some errors were made. But I do know that here, also, the FHA has tightened up on its requirements to correct deficiencies which have been detected.

As with most industries, housing has had a few unscrupulous operators.

The record shows that FHA has moved aggressively to isolate and to eliminate shady operators from its programs.

FHA Commissioner Philip N. Brownstein has assured me of his determination to eliminate opportunities for malpractice on the part of persons doing business with the FHA.

No one has ever said that the operations of the Federal Housing Administration are perfect or that human beings are not subject to human error. But, there has been no evidence of fraud or willful misconduct on the part of any employee of the Federal Housing Administration in connection with the recent criticisms.

I believe we should look to FHA's past achievements as a guide to its chances for future success.

We are faced with new and greater challenges of future growth and development as a Nation. I hope and expect that FHA will be the catalyst for bringing many of our national aspirations in the field of housing to broad realization.

GERMAN GOVERNMENT'S SALE OF STEEL TO RED CHINA

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. KEE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my opposition to the German Government's approval of a sale of a \$176 million steel complex to Communist China. I regard this sale as a threat to the future security of the United States and as an expression of selfish disregard on the part of the German Government for the policies of the United States.

Why must we contribute so much to

the economic development and security of a nation and then remain silent when this same nation approves of action that is contrary to our policies and will ultimately prove detrimental to our security and that of the free world? Let us not fool ourselves. Any contribution to the industrial development of Red China further threatens the security of the free world for Red China has not manifested any intent to pursue a peaceful course in the future.

How absurd that we should have 200,000 American men in West Germany to protect this nation from a Communist takeover and remain silent when this same nation approves of action that strengthens the most aggressive member of the Communist bloc.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the time has come for the United States to raise its voice in opposition to those nations whom we have helped and are helping and whose current actions threaten our efforts to maintain peaceful order in a much troubled world.

TO CORRECT A MISTAKE—AN AMENDMENT TO THE COLD WAR GI BILL

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. KEE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 of this year the President signed into law a measure which we in Congress labored many years to see enacted. I refer of course to the cold war GI bill of rights, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. This is a monumental piece of legislation in terms of its certain impact not only on the veteran community but on the country as a whole. As one of the original sponsors of the bill, I have long anticipated the successful completion of our legislative struggle to provide benefits to veterans who served after the Korean conflict it is a matter of equity. It is also a matter of good sense. The promises of higher educational accomplishments, of increased earning power, and of a more productive society do not need to be reiterated. In a short time these prophecies of the future will be current facts.

The number of veterans that are reached by this new GI bill are a good indication of the scope of this legislation. In my State of Florida more than 100,000 veterans will be eligible for assistance by the end of fiscal year 1967. Today in North Dade County, the congressional district that I represent, there are an estimated 10,500 eligible post-Korean veterans. More than 1,300 of them are expected to take advantage of the new educational benefits in the first year alone. In addition to the \$841,000 in direct educational benefits that will go to these North Dade veterans in fiscal year 1967, the program is also expected to provide guaranteed loans totaling \$1½ million to some 110 veterans in my district.

When we approve legislation that is going to play an important part in the lives of so many people, we have to make sure that it is properly and efficiently